

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 3068

Mar.	1, 1968	Sen. Ellender introduced S. 3068 which was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.
May	15, 1968	Senate committee voted to report S. 3068.
May	16, 1968	Senate committee reported S. 3068 without amendment. S. Report No. 1130. Print of report.
May	17, 1968	Senate passed S. 3068 without amendment.
May	21, 1968	Senate reconsidered action of May 17 and repassed S. 3068 with a technical amendment.
May	22, 1968	S. 3068 was referred to House Agriculture Committee. No copy of bill as referred.
July	1, 1968	Rep. May introduced and discussed H. R. 18249 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill and remarks of author.
July	2, 1968	House committee reported H. R. 18249 without amendment. H. Report No. 1619. Print of bill and report.
July	11, 1968	House Rules Committee reported resolution for the consideration of H. R. 18249.
July	29, 1968	House began debate on H. R. 18249.
July	30, 1968	House passed S. 3068 with amendment (in lieu of H. R. 18249). H. R. 18249 laid on table due to passage of S. 3068.
Aug.	1, 1968	Senate conferees were appointed.
Sept.	10, 1968	House conferees were appointed.
Sept.	19, 1968	House received conference report on S. 3068. H. Report No. 1908. Print of report.
Sept.	25, 1968	House agreed to conference report.
Sept.	26, 1968	Senate agreed to conference report.
Oct.	8, 1968	Approved: Public Law 90-552.

S. 3068

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 1, 1968

Mr. ELLENDER (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice
and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the
4 Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by delet-
5 ing the phrase “not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal
6 year ending June 30, 1969;” and inserting in lieu thereof
7 the phrase “not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the fiscal
8 year ending June 30, 1969;”.

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

By Mr. ELLENDER

MARCH 1, 1968

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

May 15, 1968

- 4 -

6. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. H. J. Res. 1268, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1968 for highways and certain claims, was ordered to lie on the table. p. S5570
7. FOOD STAMPS; FORESTRY; COMMODITY EXCHANGES; LOANS; WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) without amendment S. 3068, authorizing \$245 million for the Food Stamp Act for fiscal year 1969; S. 2337, authorizing establishment of the Cradle of Forestry in America in the Pisgah National Forest, N.C.; S. 3143, making frozen concentrated orange juice subject to the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; S. J. Res. 168, authorizing temporary emergency funds for the Farmers Home Administration; and H. R. 15822, authorizing establishment of the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest, Okla.; and with amendment S. 2276, permitting Secretary of Agriculture to contract for works of improvement under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act upon request of local organizations. pp. D435-6
8. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states the Agriculture and Forestry Committee "announced that it had agreed to act this year on the extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-321), and that it plans to hold hearings on a bill, to be introduced by Senator Ellender, embodying amendments to this act proposed during recent hearings." p. D436
9. POVERTY; BUILDINGS. Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserted an SCLC statement that participants in the Poor People's Campaign might "hang around" this Department. p. S5498 (May 14)
20. FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION. Sen. Scott was added as a cosponsor of S. 3165, to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act to provide for loans to public bodies which, upon sale by the Farmers Home Administration, shall bear taxable interest. p. S5621
- ARTS AND HUMANITIES. Sen. Pell commended President Johnson's interest in arts and humanities and inserted the President's remarks at the dedication of the Smithsonian Institution's National Collection of Fine Arts. pp. S5629-30
22. AWARDS; FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Ellender commended the "Department's growth and increased responsibility" and inserted his speech made at the USDA Honor Awards Ceremony May 14. pp. S5636-7
23. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Metcalf quoted a welfare administrator who wrote, "Utility charges...is an area where poor people suffer the most," and inserted an article from Electrical World. pp. S5649-51
24. HORSES. Sen. Hansen inserted material regarding the problems arising over the fate of the wild horse herd in the Pryor Mountain area of Wyo. and Mont. pp. S5652-3

May 16, 1968

- 3 -

10. REDWOOD PARK. Rep. Don H. Clausen criticized proposals in the Redwood Park proposed legislation "which would take tens of thousands of acres of private timber-growing lands" and spoke in support of his bill which would create a Redwood National Park and Seashore and would not "create economic devastation." pp. H3896-7
11. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Natcher congratulated the REA on its 33rd anniversary for "bringing to light the vital importance of farm efficiency and rural development." p. H3899
12. HOUSING. Rep. Patman inserted a Washington Post article in recognition of Rep. Sullivan's sponsorship of the rehabilitation housing program. pp. H3920-1
13. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Rees inserted Rep. Ashley's testimony in which he discussed the "problems arising from our international trade agreements and how these problems relate to the current imbalance of payments." pp. H3918-19
14. LEGISLATIVE RECORD. Rep. Stratton inserted a summary of the "accomplishments of the first session of this 90th Congress." pp. H3922-3
15. FOREIGN SERVICE. Received from State a proposed bill "to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946; to Foreign Affairs Committee. p. H3924
16. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the following program for next week: Mon., Consent Calendar and under suspension Farm Credit Adm. amendments, and assaults on postal employees. Tues., Interior appropriations. Wed. and the balance of the week, grain standards; emergency credit revolving fund; and Land and Water Conservation Fund Act amendment. pp. H3892-3
17. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 20. p. H3924

SENATE

18. ~~WATERSHEDS, FORESTRY, LOANS, COMMODITY EXCHANGES, FOOD STAMPS.~~ The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment ~~S. 2837, to authorize this Department to establish the Cradle of Forestry in America in the Pisgah National Forest, N. C. (S. Rept. 1129); S. 3068, to authorize appropriation of \$245 million under the Food Stamp Act for the fiscal year 1969 (S. Rept. 1130); S. 3143, to make frozen concentrated orange juice~~ subject to the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (S. Rept. 1128); S. J. Res. 168, to authorize the temporary funding of the emergency credit revolving fund (S. Rept. 1127); H. R. 15822, to authorize this Department to establish the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest, Okla. (S. Rept. 1126); H. R. 15364, to provide for increased U. S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank (S. Rept. 1131); and with amendment S. 2276, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit this Department to contract for

INCREASE IN 1969 AUTHORIZATION FOR FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

MAY 16 (legislative day, MAY 14), 1968.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3068]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3068) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

This bill would increase the appropriation authorization for fiscal 1969 for the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to \$245 million (from \$225 million).

This bill is needed to permit orderly growth of the program. In December 1967 the number of areas designated under the program totaled 1,239. By June 30, 1968, total participation in these areas is expected to be about 2,750,000 persons, which will take the full \$225 million authorized for fiscal 1969, leaving no room for expansion.

In order to assure proper administration of the food stamp program the committee recommends that the Department make clear to dealers and food stamp recipients, through written statements furnished to them, store display signs, and otherwise, the purposes for which food stamps may be used and the penalties for misuse of stamps, or other violations of the act.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

The letter from the Secretary of Agriculture requesting enactment of this bill is attached.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 28, 1968.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

This bill would amend section 16(a) of the Food Stamp Act. It would increase the maximum appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1969 from \$225 million to \$245 million. No other change in the present provisions of the act is proposed in this bill.

This increase in the 1969 appropriation authority is necessary if we are to continue in an orderly way to extend the availability of food assistance to the poor.

While the availability of food assistance, will not, of itself, assure that the food problems of the poor will be solved, program availability is the essential first step—the step upon which we can work to refine program operations in an effort to reach, and improve the diets of, all eligible needy families.

We are undertaking intensive efforts with States to complete arrangements for the inauguration of a USDA food assistance program in every county without such a program. However, many counties that now have a commodity distribution program have had their requests to enter the food stamp program on file for considerable periods of time.

We are giving special priority to the 331 of the 1,000 lowest income counties which were not operating a food program in July 1967. In this effort we are emphasizing the immediate availability of our commodity distribution program.

We are finding, however, that a substantial number of counties without a food program prefer to offer food aid to their low-income families under the food stamp program. As a result of our recent effort, a total of 188 such counties have been designated for the food stamp program, including 84 of the 331 lowest income counties.

In December 1967, we designated a total of 389 new food stamp project areas, bringing the program to 1,239 designated areas. These new designations, made within the 1968 fiscal year appropriation of \$185 million are expected to bring total participation in the program to about 2,750,000 by June 30, 1968.

The maximum appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1969 of \$225 million would be required, based upon current cost data, to continue the program at the 2,750,000 participant level. Thus, without an increase in appropriation authority the program could not move forward in line with the President's recommendations contained in his budget message and "Prosperity and Progress for the Farmer and Rural America."

For these reasons we urge an increase in the maximum appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1969 from \$225 million to \$245 million.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that this proposed bill is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.
S.R. 1130

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

* * * * *

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 16. (a) To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; not in excess of \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and not in excess of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; not in excess of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of **[\$225,000,000]** \$245,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose and in no event shall it be carried out with funds derived from permanent appropriations.

○

Calendar No. 1113

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3068

[Report No. 1130]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 1, 1968

Mr. ELLENDER (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 16 (legislative day, MAY 14), 1968

Reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, without amendment

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the
4 Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by delet-
5 ing the phrase "not in excess of \$255,000,000 for the fiscal
6 year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof
7 the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the fiscal
8 year ending June 30, 1969;".

II

S. 3068

[Report No. 1130]

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

By Mr. FLENDER

MARCH 1, 1968

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

MAY 16 (legislative day, MAY 14), 1968

Reported without amendment

INDEX of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 20, 1968
For actions of May 17, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 85

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....17	Forestry.....2,3,13	Organization.....12
Civil defense.....5	Food stamps.....1	Population.....16
Commodity exchanges.....4	Highways.....13	Small business.....15,20
Emergency funds.....7	Hunger.....9	Taxation.....11
Employment.....16	Kerr Memorial.....2	Water pollution.....8,14
Environmental quality.....8,14	Loans.....7	Watersheds.....6
Flood control.....6,19	Meat inspection.....18,20	Wilderness.....13
Foreign trade.....10	Orange juice.....4	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed food stamp bill. Senate passed bill to establish Cradle of Forestry. Senate passed bill to establish Kerr Memorial Arboretum.

SENATE

1. FOOD STAMPS. Passed without amendment S. 3068, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 so as to increase the authorization for fiscal year 1969 from \$225,000,000 to \$245,000,000. At the request of Sen. Mansfield the following excerpt from the committee report was inserted:

"This bill is needed to permit orderly growth of the program. In December 1967 the number of areas designated under the program totaled 1,239. By June 30, 1968, total participation in these areas is expected to be about 2,750,000 persons, which will take the full \$225 million authorized for fiscal 1969, leaving no room for expansion.

"In order to assure proper administration of the food stamp program the committee recommends that the Department make clear to dealers and food stamp recipients, through written statements furnished to them, store display signs, and otherwise, the purposes for which food stamps may be used and the penalties for misuse of stamps, or other violations of the act." p. S5776

2. KERR MEMORIAL. Passed without amendment H. R. 15822, to authorize this Department to establish the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest, Okla. This bill will now be sent to the President. At the request of Sen. Mansfield the following excerpt from the committee report was inserted:

"This bill provides for establishment of the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma, to be administered under national forest laws and regulations so as to promote learning about nature and forest land management. Cooperation with, and receipt of contributions from, public and private sources is authorized. The boundaries would be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, published in the Federal Register, and shown on a map in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service." p. S5775

3. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment S. 2837, to authorize this Department to establish the Cradle of Forestry in America in the Pisgah National Forest, N. C. At the request of Sen. Mansfield the following excerpt from the committee report was inserted:

"This bill provides for establishment of the Cradle of Forestry in America in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina, to be administered under national forest laws and regulations so as to promote knowledge about forestry education and forest land management. Cooperation with, and receipt of contributions from, public and private sources is authorized...The area consists of about 6,800 acres around the site of the Biltmore Forest School, the first technical forestry school in America." pp. S5775-6

4. ORANGE JUICE. Passed without amendment S. 3143, to make frozen concentrated orange juice subject to the Commodity Exchange Act. p. S5775

5. CIVIL DEFENSE. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment S. 15004, to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder (S. Rept. 1134). p. S5779

6. WATERSHEDS. Passed over S. 2276, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to contract for the construction of works of improvement upon request of local organizations. p. S5775

rather with a map showing the boundaries which shall be those shown on the map entitled "Cradle of Forestry in America" dated April 12, 1967, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 2. The area designated as the Cradle of Forestry in America shall be administered, protected, and developed within and as a part of the Pisgah National Forest by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to national forests in such manner as in his judgment will best provide for the purposes of this Act and for such management, utilization, and disposal of the natural resources as in his judgment will promote or is compatible with and does not significantly impair the purposes for which the Cradle of Forestry in America is established.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to cooperate with and receive the cooperation of public and private agencies and organizations and individuals in the development, administration, and operation of the Cradle of Forestry in America. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to accept contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1129), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for establishment of the Cradle of Forestry in America in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina, to be administered under national forest laws and regulations so as to promote knowledge about forestry education and forest land management. Cooperation with, and receipt of contributions from, public and private sources is authorized. The boundaries would be shown on a map published in the Federal Register and would be the same as those shown on the map entitled "Cradle of Forestry in America" dated April 12, 1967. The area consists of about 6,800 acres around the site of the Biltmore Forest School, the first technical forestry school in America.

The Department estimates that the cost of planning and development will be about \$10.5 million. Operating costs will probably build up to about \$400,000 per year.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

The bill (S. 3068) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by deleting the phrase "not in excess of \$255,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1130), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill is needed to permit orderly growth of the program. In December 1967 the number of areas designated under the program totaled 1,239. By June 30, 1968, total participation in these areas is expected to be about 2,750,000 persons, which will take the full \$225 million authorized for fiscal 1969, leaving no room for expansion.

In order to assure proper administration of the food stamp program the committee recommends that the Department make clear to dealers and food stamp recipients, through written statements furnished to them, store display signs, and otherwise, the purposes for which food stamps may be used and the penalties for misuse of stamps, or other violations of the act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD AT ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech I delivered at St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y., on May 15, 1968, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TIME OF TROUBLE

(Remarks of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, at St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y., May 15, 1968)

These are difficult times in which to meet with a student body. There is still Viet Nam. There is still the volcanic condition of the nation's cities. The questions on your minds, I know, are many. The answers, I regret to say, are few. I cannot tell you what I do not know.

I can tell you that we have come to a point of deep trouble in this nation. We have come to it for many reasons. Most of all, we have come to it because we have indulged for a long time in the luxury of ignoring or tinting the nation's problems. For too long, we have downgraded their immensity and their intensity.

It is a measure of our plight at home that we tend to drift with our difficulties rather than confront them. We drift until an assassination or bonfires of metropolitan dimensions or some such abomination shocks us into the recollection that they are still there. It is a measure of our plight abroad that it has taken three years and many thousands of lives from the President's first call for a negotiated end to the war in Viet Nam to the first uncertain touching of the antennas of the negotiators in Paris.

We are in a time of trouble. Yet it does have the virtue that it may be convertible into a time of awakening. Let me consider with you, therefore, some of the sources of the difficulties which confront us both within the nation and in our relations with the rest of the world.

In recent weeks, as you know, many of the nation's cities have erupted in showers of violence. Some of us reside in these cities. Some of us have our homes in quiet places a few miles away or many hundreds of miles away. Yet, can any of us be truly isolated from the violence of the cities? Can we be insulated from these immense social heavings? Can we be impervious to tremors which shake the ideals and institutional foundations of the American experience in freedom?

To say the least, it is alien to witness, within our borders, displays of massive disorder. It is disturbing to live in the eerie stillness of curfews which are enforced by

federal troops. It is awesome to contemplate the possibilities of more violence patterned after that which occurred in mid-1967 and then, once more, a few weeks ago.

If outbreaks occur again, let there be no doubt that they will be suppressed; that is inevitable. Responsible government must act to ensure the security of persons and property. In any given situation, it is possible to quarrel with how the domestic tranquility is maintained. In any given situation, it is possible to find fault with the use of the police power; some may say excessive and others inadequate. In the end, however, there can be little debate that it is counter-violence which will be invoked in the face of violence.

Whatever view is taken of the recent outbreaks, one message which they conveyed was clear. It tells us, in terms which cannot be put aside, that there are highly combustible substances gathered in our society. These substances, to be sure, are compounds of racial inequities, frustrations, and arrogances. They also include, however, the inadequacy of a whole range of public services. They also contain the problems of concentrated poverty with its retinue of human disabilities and brooding discontents.

This is the stuff of urban violence. At the moment, the racial factor may concern us most deeply. Racial tensions, however, are but one manifestation of the social combustibility in this nation. The fact is that a high level of violence has been endemic since the beginning and in recent years it has been on the rampage.

It would, perhaps, be a path of least resistance for me, and the Montanans whom I represent in the Senate of the United States, to turn our backs on the crisis of the great cities. Montana is a spacious and beautiful place with a scant and scattered population. Many of the problems which assume huge proportions elsewhere affect Montana hardly at all. In Montana there is plenty of room. The water is pure. So is the air. Our largest city has a total population of 55,000 a fraction of the slum populations of some of the great metropolitan centers. Yet, we are one nation and Montana is part of it. If cities in other states of the Union lose their habitability, the nation loses, and Montana loses with them.

The problems of the urban areas arise from developments of many years. Most significant, perhaps, have been the vast migrations to these centers in response to an evolving economic technology and a great growth in the population. The process of human concentration, at first, attracted little notice. For a long time it aroused little concern. Now, we find three-quarters of the nation's people in the cities and adjacent suburbia.

If these areas are already caught up in a maze of problems, it is not hard to imagine what the situation could be like by the year 2000. During the next three decades, the nation's population count is expected to rise from its present 200 million level to 350 million.

The shape of the cities of the next century is still only dimly seen. What is already only too painfully visible, however, are the imperatives for the survival of the cities in the final years of the 20th century. There is, today, a plethora of urgent needs. To cite but a few, there is a need for jobs and a need for manpower training and development. There is a need for public health, housing, and recreation. There is a need for sufficient means of transportation. There is need for fully complemented, proficient, and professional police, fire, and other protection departments of government. There is a need for educational systems which are enlightened and excellent. There is a need for an assured supply of clean water and air.

Relentless effort is going to be required to meet these complex and ever-growing needs.



May 21, 1968

costs in the Department is attached. (The other pay cost supplementals for the Department are included in H. Doc. 274. See Digest 39). p. H4109

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that before going into the interstate taxation bill on Wed. the House will take up the conference report on the truth-in-lending bill. p. H4049

SENATE

12. RESEARCH. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendments H. R. 5404, to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation (S. Rept. 1137). p. S6051

The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee reported with amendment H. R. 15856, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations (S. Rept. 1136). p. S6051

13. FOOD STAMPS. Reconsidered action of Friday, May 17, passing without amendment S. 3068, authorizing \$2⁴⁵5,000,000 for the Food Stamp Program for fiscal year 1969. Repassed the bill with an amendment, to correct a printing error, fixing the amount of \$2⁴⁵5,000,000. p. S5988

14. INFORMATION; TECHNICAL SERVICES; PESTICIDES; TRADE. The Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6279, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to arrange for the collection of standard reference data for the benefit of scientists and the general public (amended); S. 3245, extending authorizations for activities under the State Technical Services Act (amended to extend for 3 years); H. R. 15979, to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of pesticides (amended so as to substitute therefor the language of S. 3228, a similar bill); and, S. 3065, to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that Act. p. D460

15. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Sen. Williams, Del., stated that Congress should not recess for Memorial Day without having acted upon this (excise tax bill) conference report and inserted material to support his point. pp. S5982-7

16. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Byrd, Va., spoke in favor of "trade between the nations" but recommended against using Government funds "to finance trade with countries...which are supplying North Vietnam." pp. S5988-9

17. POVERTY. Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserted a memorandum which contains "Demands of Poor People's Campaign to Executive Agencies" including those made of this Department. pp. S6055-6060

Sen. Mondale inserted an article describing the "endless cycle...of hunger, poverty, sickness, and death among the poor." pp. S6065-7



Internal funds of TVA, generated from power operations, the sale of power bonds and notes, were not affected, because they are not part of the administrative budget. This, I understand, has been stricken in conference.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for once again, with his letter from the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, making it abundantly clear that TVA's internal funds, power funds, revenues from the sale of bonds and power notes, are not affected by the proposed decrease in expenditures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are not affected any more than they would have been under the proposed \$4 billion reduction or, for that matter, under existing law except as to degree. I quote from the last paragraph of the letter just placed in the Record.

To summarize, no part of the proposed \$6 billion reduction in expenditures would have to be assigned to the TVA, although the President, in his discretion could so assign some portion of the reduction.

That also would be true of the \$4 billion. It could be true of the existing law, if we assume that we killed the conference report and made no reductions. In approving this reduction we specifically made no exceptions but left to Congress and the executive branch an opportunity to work out the system of priorities, as to where they will apply the reductions, as the Senator knows.

The bill did spell out, however, that social security payments and veterans' benefits as provided under existing law would not be affected, but these were not considered exceptions since they were already mandatory. The bill did provide that the special costs of the Vietnam war and the interest on the national debt would not be included since they were both recognized as uncontrollable items.

I thank the Senator for his remarks, and I thank him for calling attention to the particular project in his State with respect to which he received notice that it would be canceled if we retained the \$6 billion expenditure reduction. I am aware of the fact that many Members of Congress are receiving such calls. I have received some calls from agencies in our State that they are receiving notice from Washington that if expenditures are reduced by \$6 billion their programs will be cut by x amount. This practice is nothing but an indirect attempt on the part of the administration to defeat a bill which it does not have the courage to face up to in an election year.

OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 917) to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield 7½ minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield a like amount of time to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on a subject which is not germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on Friday, May 17, the Senate passed S. 3068. The bill was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry without amendment, and was passed by the Senate without amendment. However, there was a mistake in printing the bill, as reported, so that as printed it differed from the bill as introduced.

In order to correct the Record, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which S. 3068 passed the Senate on Friday, May 17, be reconsidered, together with the third reading; that the bill be amended by striking from line 5, page 1, the figure "\$255,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$225,000,000"; and that the bill be read a third time and be repassed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3068), as amended, read the third time, and passed, is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by deleting the phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;"

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings tomorrow on a Senate joint resolution relating to East-West trade. The resolution offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] states:

Public misconceptions plague efforts to expand East-West trade.

And it resolves that the Export Control Act regulations and the Export-Import Bank finance restrictions should be mod-

ified to permit an increase between the United States and of Eastern Europe.

As a businessman, and through the years has been an I believe strongly in the elimination of trade barriers wherever possible.

I think it important that the trade between the nations of the world be free.

One of the businesses in which, involved, the growing and selling of goods, tends to prosper when there are good export possibilities, and it is those years when the export is small.

So I do not speak as one who is to trade among the nations of the world. I speak as one who favors trade between the nations.

Now, the Senator from Minnesota addressed to the Senate on May 17, he presented Senate Joint Resolution 100, which made a sharp attack on legislation which I introduced last August and which the Senate approved last August, and the House of Representatives also approved. He made a sharp attack on legislation offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MONDALE] which I was cosponsor.

In adopting the Byrd amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act, the Senate simultaneously did two things. First, in a sharp, clear-cut fight, it voted against the President's authority and the President's own constitutional prerogative in the field of foreign affairs. Second, it made unmistakably clear that American tax dollars shall not be used for the benefit of nations supplying our enemy.

This amendment, along with the Mundt-Byrd amendment, prevented the use of Export-Import Bank funds to build or equip a Fiat automobile for the Soviet Union.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that the Export-Import Bank funds are for the use of which come from the pockets of the taxpayers, from pockets of the wage earners of the United States.

The Byrd amendment would prevent the use of tax funds to finance trade with nations supplying North Vietnam, long as North Vietnam is at war with the United States.

It would automatically cease to be operative with the ending of the Vietnam conflict. Nor would the legislation enacted by the Congress apply to trade with any nation except those nations which supply an enemy at war with the United States.

This amendment does not restrict trade.

It says the American wage earner's dollar that he pays to the Government in taxes shall not be used to trade with those nations which are supplying the American enemy. Trade can continue, but the American taxpayer need not finance it.

The Senator from Minnesota in his Senate speech said:

The harshest restrictions (the Byrd Amendment and the Mundt-Byrd Amendment) coming from Congress have been placed on Export-Import Bank assistance for trade with Communist countries.

S. 3068

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 22, 1968

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AN ACT

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the
4 Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by delet-
5 ing the phrase "not in excess of \$255,000,000 for the fiscal
6 year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof
7 the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the fiscal
8 year ending June 30, 1969;".

Passed the Senate May 17, 1968.

Attest:

FRANCIS R. VALEO,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

MAY 22, 1968

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 18249

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 1, 1968

Mrs. MAY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the
4 Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by de-
5 leting the phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the
6 fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu
7 thereof the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the
8 fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;".

9 SEC. 2. Section 5 (b) of such Act is amended by add-
10 ing at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any
11 other provision of law, any person who is engaged in a strike,

1 labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage shall be ineligible
2 to participate in any food stamp program established pursu-
3 ant to this Act: *Provided*, That if any such person was
4 eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant
5 to the provisions of this Act prior to the existence of a strike,
6 labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage, such person shall
7 not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program
8 solely as a result of engaging in such strike, labor dispute, or
9 voluntary work stoppage. Notwithstanding any other provi-
10 sion of law, any person who is a student attending an insti-
11 tution of higher learning shall be ineligible to participate in
12 any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act:
13 *Provided further*, That if any such person was eligible for
14 and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the
15 provisions of this Act prior to being enrolled as a student at
16 an institution of higher learning, such person shall not be
17 ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely
18 as the result of being a student attending an institution of
19 higher learning.”

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 18249

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

By Mrs. May

JULY 1, 1968

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

consideration to Consent Calendar No. 209, the bill (H.R. 13780) to provide for sale or exchange of isolated tracts of tribal lands on the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I simply want to say that I have been advised now that the Bureau of the Budget had no intention, or at least now has no intention, to send up any supplementary report on this legislation. Therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13780

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana, may dispose of or acquire tribal lands within the exterior boundaries of the reservation in trust on the conditions hereinafter set forth, which transactions may be accomplished by any combination of cash, terms, or exchange with or without the giving or receipt of boot.

SEC. 2. Said Confederated Tribes may dispose of lands beneficially owned by them and held by the United States in trust only as to the following lands:

Township 17 north, range 20 west, M.P.M., section 6, lots 2, 3, 4, containing 118.53 acres.

Township 18 north, range 21 west, M.P.M., section 20, north half north half northwest quarter southeast quarter, containing 10.00 acres.

Township 19 north, range 21 west, M.P.M., section 28 south half northeast quarter, containing 80.00 acres.

Township 20 north, range 21 west, M.P.M., section 1 northeast quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres.

Township 22 north, range 22 west, M.P.M., section 3 north half southeast quarter, containing 80.00 acres.

Township 19 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 5 northeast quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres; section 35 south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, containing 160.00 acres.

Township 20 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 15 northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, containing 200.00 acres; section 17 west half southwest quarter, containing 80.00 acres; section 18 southeast quarter northeast quarter, east half southeast quarter, containing 120.00 acres; section 29 northwest quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres; section 30 northeast quarter southeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres; section 29 west half southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter, containing 5.00 acres; section 32 northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, containing 2.50 acres.

Township 22 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 9 southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, west half southeast quarter, containing 240.00 acres.

Township 23 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 3 southwest quarter northeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres; section 5 west half southeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, containing 60.00 acres; section 17 southeast quarter southeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres; section 19 lots 2 and 4, southeast

quarter northwest quarter, containing 103.21 acres.

Township 24 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 19, southwest quarter, northeast quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southeast quarter, containing 160.00 acres; section 20, southwest quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres; section 30, northeast quarter northeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres.

Township 23 north, range 24 west, M.P.M., section 1, northeast quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres; section 3, northwest quarter southeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres; section 24, northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, south half southeast quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres.

Township 24 north, range 24 west, M.P.M., section 1, lot 2, containing 26.10 acres; section 35, northwest quarter northeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres.

SEC. 3. Said Confederated Tribes may acquire Indian or non-Indian-owned lands in trust to hold for tribal use or for alienation to tribal members in trust. The authority herein contained is in addition to existing authority to acquire tribal lands.

SEC. 4. Any transfer of lands hereunder shall be subject to the prior approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out everything through page 2, line 2, and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That upon request of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana, acting through their governing body, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to dispose of the following described tribal lands within the exterior boundaries of the reservation by sale at not less than fair market value or by exchange: *Provided*, That the values of any lands so exchanged either shall be approximately equal in fair market value, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances requires."

On page 4, after line 12, insert the following sentence: "The net proceeds from the sales or exchange of lands pursuant to this section shall be used to acquire within a reasonable time additional lands within the reservation boundaries in accordance with section 2 of this Act."

On page 4, lines 13 through 20, strike out all of sections 3 and 4 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 2. Upon request of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire Indian or non-Indian-owned lands within the reservation boundaries for such tribes, and such lands may be held for tribal use or for sale to tribal members. Title to lands acquired pursuant to this authority shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribes or the tribal member to whom the land is sold."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 2701) to provide for sale or exchange of isolated tracts of tribal lands on the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2701

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That upon request of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana, acting through their governing body, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to dispose of the following described tribal lands within the exterior boundaries of the reservation by sale at not less than fair market value or by exchange: *Provided*, That the values of any lands so exchanged either shall be approximately equal in fair market value, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require:*

Township 17 north, range 20 west, M.P.M., sections 6 lots 2, 3, 4, containing 118.53 acres.

Township 18 north, range 21 west, M.P.M., section 20 north half north half northwest quarter southeast quarter, containing 10.00 acres.

Township 19 north, range 21 west, M.P.M., section 28 south half northeast quarter, containing 80.00 acres.

Township 20 north, range 21 west, M.P.M., section 1 northeast quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres.

Township 22 north, range 22 west, M.P.M., section 3 north half of southeast quarter, containing 80.00 acres.

Township 19 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 5 northeast quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres; section 35 south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, containing 160.00 acres.

Township 20 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 15 northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, containing 200.00 acres;

section 17 west half southwest quarter, containing 80.00 acres;

section 18 southeast quarter northeast quarter, east half southeast quarter, containing 120.00 acres;

section 29 northwest quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres;

section 30 northeast quarter southeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres;

section 29 west half southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter, containing 5.00 acres;

section 32 northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, containing 2.50 acres.

Township 22 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 9 southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, west half southeast quarter, containing 240.00 acres.

Township 23 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 3 southwest quarter northeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres;

section 5 west half southeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, containing 60.00 acres;

section 17 southeast quarter southeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres;

section 19 lots 2 and 4, southeast quarter northwest quarter, containing 103.21 acres.

Township 24 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 19 southwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, east half southeast quarter, containing 160.00 acres;

section 20 southwest quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres;
section 30 northeast quarter northeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres.

Township 23 north, range 23 west, M.P.M., section 1 northeast quarter southwest quarter, containing 40.00 acres;
section 3 northwest quarter southeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres;
section 24 northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, south half southeast quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres.

Township 24 north, range 24 west, M.P.M., section 1 lot 2, containing 26.10 acres;
section 35 northwest quarter northeast quarter, containing 40.00 acres.

SEC. 2. Upon request of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire or non-Indian-owned lands within the reservation boundaries for such tribes, and such lands may be held for tribal use or for sale to tribal members. Title to lands acquired pursuant to this authority shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribes or individual for whom the land is acquired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2701 and insert the provisions of H.R. 13780, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 13780) was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16703, AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speak-

er's table the bill (H.R. 16703) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, together with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS, HARDY, ICHORD, IRWIN, MACHEN, BATES, GUBSER, KING of New York, and DICKINSON.

There was no objection.

AMENDING FOOD STAMP ACT

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

This bill is being introduced at the direction of the full Committee on Agriculture, and it contains two sections.

Section 1 represents the administration's request submitted to the committee in February of this year. It provides for a \$20 million increase in the authorization for expenditures during fiscal year 1969 on the food stamp program. It is identical to the bill passed earlier this year by the other body and an earlier bill introduced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Section 2 reflects amendments adopted by the committee last week. The first deals with the eligibility of strikers for participation in the food stamp program. The second deals with students attending institutions of higher learning.

I have introduced this bill at the request of the committee in order to move this legislation to the House for prompt consideration.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman cleared that with this side of the aisle?

Mr. PERKINS. I have talked with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] about it, and there is no objection on his part.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF SOMALI REPUBLIC

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, It gives me great pleasure to extend, in my own name and in behalf of the Congress of the United States of America, to the President, to the Government, and to the people of the Somali Republic warm congratulations on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of their country's independence.

In March of this year we were privileged to host in America a distinguished delegation from Somalia led by Prime Minister Mohamed Ibrahim Egal. During this happy occasion we all recognized that our two peoples, Somalis and Americans, are dedicated to the same fundamental ideals. Somalis and Americans believe in democratic government, in the importance of the individual man, in freedom under law for all, and in a Supreme Being over all our affairs.

In the past year Somalia has followed policies initiated by President Abdirashid Ali Shermarke and Prime Minister Egal which are an inspiration to us all. Dedicated to progress in peace, Somalia in cooperation with neighboring Ethiopia and Kenya has worked to improve the well-being of all peoples in its part of the world. The success of these neighbors working together gives hope to other leaders of nations vexed by similar inherited problems. They have shown that men of good will by patient effort and mutual respect can make this a better world.

It is thus with especial feeling that we extend to President and to the Somali Ambassador to the United States. His Excellency Yusuf O. Azhari Shermarke of the Somali Republic our sincere and best wishes on the anniversary of Somalia's independence.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17734, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 17734, the second supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1968.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1608)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17734) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, and 28.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 16, 18, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33,

~~HIGHLIGHT~~ of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 3, 1968
For actions of July 2, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 114

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	28	Federal aid.....	24,40	Peanuts.....	43
Animal drugs.....	6	Flood control.....	17,52	Personnel.....	4,21,39,58
Appropriations....	13,24,56	Food stamps.....	1,12	Pine gum.....	1
Census.....	25	Foreign agriculture....	22	Poverty.....	23,35
Coffee.....	44,53	Foreign aid.....	3,36	Public Law 480.....	8
Conservation.....	14,34	Foreign trade.....	11,46	Public works.....	17,52
Consumer.....	33	Freight rates.....	32	REA loans.....	20
Cotton.....	54	Grains.....	18	Reclamation.....	2,15
County committee employees.....	58	Health.....	39,48	Retirement.....	4,39
Credit banks.....	45	Highways.....	7	Safety.....	48
Dairy indemnity.....	1	Hunger.....	38	Technical services....	51
Defense production...	49,57	Indemnity payments....	1	Transportation..	5,10,27,32
Education.....	9,30	Lands.....	41	Trees.....	29
Electrification.....	20,26	Milk marketing.....	37	Water.....	19,31,47
Employment.....	42	Ombudsman.....	55	Watersheds.....	19
Farm income.....	43	Orange juice.....	1	Wildlife.....	16
		Organization.....	50		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on second supplemental appropriation bill. House committee reported dairy indemnity, food stamp, and pine-gum price support bills. Conferees agreed to file report on Public Law 480 bill. Senate subcommittee approved grain inspection bill. House debated highway authorization bill. House Rules Committee cleared foreign aid authorization bill.

HOUSE

1. DAIRY; FOOD STAMP; PINE GUM; ORANGE JUICE. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 17752, to provide indemnity payments to dairy farmers (H. Rept. 1614); H. R. 18249, to amend the Food Stamp Act (H. Rept. 1619); S. 2511, to maintain and improve the income of producers of crude pine gum and stabilize production of crude pine gum (H. Rept. 1620); and S. 3143, to make frozen concentrated orange juice subject to the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (H. Rept. 1621). p. H5954

LEGISLATIVE REPORTING

90TH CONGRESS }
2d Session }

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES }

REPORT
No. 1619

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

LAW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING

Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.

Wash. D. C. Ext. 465

INCREASE IN 1969 AUTHORIZATION FOR FOOD STAMP
PROGRAM

JULY 2, 1968.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. POAGE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 18249]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill
(H.R. 18249) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended,
having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amend-
ment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

This bill would increase the appropriation authorization for the
fiscal year 1969 for the Food Stamp Act of 1964 by \$20 million from
\$225 million to \$245 million.

This bill is needed to permit orderly growth of the program. In
December 1967, the number of areas designated under the program
totaled 1,239. By June 30, 1968, total participation in these areas is
expected to be about 2,750,000 persons, which will take the full \$225
million authorized for fiscal 1969, leaving no room for expansion.

NEED

During the decade of the sixties the concept of family food assistance
programs has shifted from the distribution of a few surplus food items
to the increase of food purchasing power through the use of food
stamps. In 1960 the Department of Agriculture had only the com-
modity distribution program as a tool for family feeding and was
reaching about 3½ million needy people in family units. In 1968, the
food stamp program having been added to the feeding program, the
Department of Agriculture was reaching 6.1 million people in 2,406
counties with commodities or food stamps. All of the 1,000 poorest
counties are being, or soon will be, included.

In food stamp areas the minimum purchase requirement was reduced from \$2 per person per month to 50 cents per person, or an overall maximum of \$3 per family. Purchase requirements for new participants were cut in half for the first month to ease the transition from a credit to a cash basis. Low-income people were being hired to assist in reaching eligible nonparticipants. Food stamp participation was increased by a monthly average of 300,000 people in those 830 areas that were in operation in June of 1967. Additional participants were added in new areas taken into the program during fiscal year 1968.

Stamps provide the low-income family with a means or a wider, more varied diet. They incorporate the self-help principle. They utilize the best food distribution system in the world, our commercial marketing complex. In fiscal year 1968, \$185 million was appropriated for the food stamp program, out of \$200 million authorized. With this bill, and an appropriation of the full authorization, an increase of \$60 million, almost a one-third increase, would be realized in the food stamp program in fiscal year 1969.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The food stamp program was devised as an additional means of raising the level of nutrition in economically needy households. It was envisioned as an aid to families on welfare; the unemployable, the aged, blind, disabled, and mothers with dependent children. It was designed to serve the persons on small pensions, the unemployed, the underemployed, and the unskilled. The principle was to stretch the dollars of those persons spent for food. Through a graduated scale of eligibility those least fortunate received the greatest benefits from stamps.

The committee received testimony of abuses which exist in the present administration of the food stamp program, abuses which lend the use of stamps to support participants in voluntary work stoppages or labor disputes. There was also testimony that use of the stamps by college students was being permitted in some jurisdictions.

In view of the original intent and purposes of the food stamp program, the acute need to stretch the funds of Government to reach as many of the needy as possible and the adequacy of other resources, public and private, to help students and participants in industrial disagreements, the committee voted to prohibit the use of stamps either to aid education or to support industrial disputes.

The amendments were modified so that any person eligible for stamps would not, by virtue of becoming involved in a labor dispute or entering an institution of higher learning, without any other change of condition, be disqualified from continuing to obtain necessary nutritional assistance.

COST

The bill simply increases the maximum appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1969 from \$225 to \$245 million, an increase of \$20 million.

DEPARTMENT'S POSITION

The Secretary of Agriculture stated his position as of February 28, 1968, in the following communication:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1968.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

This bill would amend section 16(a) of the Food Stamp Act. It would increase the maximum appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1969 from \$225 million to \$245 million. No other change in the present provisions of the act is proposed in this bill.

This increase in the 1969 appropriation authority is necessary if we are to continue in an orderly way to extend the availability of food assistance to the poor.

While the availability of food assistance, will not, of itself, assure that the food problems of the poor will be solved, program availability is the essential first step—the step upon which we can work to refine program operations in an effort to reach, and improve the diets of, all eligible needy families.

We are undertaking intensive efforts with States to complete arrangements for the inauguration of a USDA food assistance program in every county without such a program. However, many counties that now have a commodity distribution program have had their requests to enter the food stamp program on file for considerable periods of time.

We are giving special priority to the 331 of the 1,000 lowest income counties which were not operating a food program in July 1967. In this effort we are emphasizing the immediate availability of our commodity distribution program.

We are finding, however, that a substantial number of counties without a food program prefer to offer food aid to their low-income families under the food stamp program. As a result of our recent effort, a total of 188 such counties have been designated for the food stamp program, including 84 of the 331 lowest income counties.

In December 1967, we designated a total of 389 new food stamp project areas, bringing the program to 1,239 designated areas. These new designations, made within the 1968 fiscal year appropriation of \$185 million are expected to bring total participation in the program to about 2,750,000 by June 30, 1968.

The maximum appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1969 of \$225 million would be required, based upon current cost data, to continue the program at the 2,750,000 participant level. Thus, without an increase in appropriation authority the program could not move forward in line with the President's recommendations contained in his budget message and "Prosperity and Progress for the Farmer and Rural America."

For these reasons we urge an increase in the maximum appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1969 from \$225 million to \$245 million.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that this proposed bill is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

* * * * *

At a later date, June 12, 1968, the Secretary testified to a somewhat different position. This testimony is included in the record of the hearings.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

* * * * *

ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS

SEC. 5. (a) Participation in the food stamp program shall be limited to those households whose income is determined to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet.

(b) In complying with the limitation on participation set forth in subsection (a) above, each State agency shall establish standards to determine the eligibility of applicant households. Such standards shall include maximum income limitations consistent with the income standards used by the State agency in administration of its federally aided public assistance programs. Such standards also shall place a limitation on the resources to be allowed eligible households. The standards of eligibility to be used by each State for the food stamp program shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary. *Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is engaged in a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: Provided, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to the existence of a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as a result of engaging in such strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is a student attending an institution of higher learning shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: Provided further, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to being enrolled as a student at an institution of higher learning, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as the result of being a student attending an institution of higher learning.*

* * * * *

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 16. (a) To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; not in excess of \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and not in excess of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; not in excess of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of **[\$225,000,000]** \$245,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose and in no event shall it be carried out with funds derived from permanent appropriations.

(b) In any fiscal year, the Secretary shall limit the value of those coupons issued which is in excess of the value of coupons for which households are charged, to an amount which is not in excess of the portion of the appropriation for such fiscal year which is transferred to the separate account under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. If in any fiscal year the Secretary finds that the requirements of participating States will exceed the limitation set forth herein, the Secretary shall direct State agencies to reduce the amount of such coupons to be issued to participating households to the extent necessary to comply with the provisions of this subsection.

(c) If the Secretary determines that any of the funds in the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act are no longer required to carry out the provisions of this Act, such portion of such funds shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

(d) Amounts expended under the authority of this Act shall not be considered amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the agricultural price-support program and appropriations for the purposes of this Act shall be considered, for the purposes of budget presentations, to relate to the functions of the Government concerned with welfare.



THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE FIRST

BY

JOHN BURNET

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME THE SECOND

AND

A HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE SECOND

BY

JOHN BURNET

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

IN TWO VOLUMES

Union Calendar No. 655

90TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 18249

[Report No. 1619]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 1, 1968

Mrs. MAY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 2, 1968

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the
4 Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by de-
5 leting the phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the
6 fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu
7 thereof the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the
8 fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;".

9 SEC. 2. Section 5 (b) of such Act is amended by add-
10 ing at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any
11 other provision of law, any person who is engaged in a strike,

Union Calendar No. 655

90TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 18249

[Report No. 1619]

A BILL

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

By Mrs. MAY

JULY 1, 1968

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 2, 1968

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 12, 1968
For actions of July 11, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 119

CONTENTS

Advertising.....	34	Flood control.....	5,28	Peach festival.....	11
Aging.....	27	Food additives.....	45	Pollution.....	31
Appropriations.....	6,21	Food stamps.....	1	Price stability.....	12
Banking.....	35	Foreign currencies.....	25	Public Law 480.....	13
Budget.....	29	Forest Service.....	21	Public works.....	5,28
Buildings.....	7	Grains.....	18	Recreation.....	24
CCC.....	22	Health.....	23	Rivers and harbors.....	5,28
Coffee.....	3	Highways.....	8	Safety.....	23
Education.....	4,41	Housing.....	20,27	Taxation.....	44
Employment.....	12,36	Hunger.....	2	Trade.....	19
Environmental sciences.....	30	Lands.....	15	Trade fairs.....	10,19
Expenditures.....	38	Legislative program.....	13	Transportation.....	17
Exports.....	33	Marketing.....	43	Urban areas.....	37
Farm income.....	14	Military construction.....	22	Watersheds.....	9,26
Farm labor.....	32	Model cities.....	27	Wheat.....	33
Farm program.....	14	Oceanography.....	16	Wildlife.....	24
Federal aid.....	39,42	Opinion poll.....	40		

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee cleared food stamp bill. House committee reported bill to establish Commission on Hunger. House committee reported bill to implement International Coffee Agreement. Senate committee reported farm bill. Senate passed grain inspection bill. Both Houses agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. FOOD STAMPS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 18249, the food stamp bill. p. H6435
2. HUNGER. The Education and Labor Committee reported with amendment H. R. 17144, to establish a Commission on Hunger (H. Rept. 1708). p. H6435
3. COFFEE. The Ways and Means Committee reported with amendment H. R. 18299, to carry out the obligations of the U. S. under the International Coffee Agreement, 1968 (H. Rept. 1704). p. H6435

S. 3425. An act to designate certain lands in the Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge, Barnstable County, Mass., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3495. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain use restrictions on a tract of land in the State of Iowa in order that such land may be used as a site for the construction of buildings or other improvements for the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3502. An act to designate certain lands in the Seney, Huron Islands, and Michigan Islands National Wildlife Refuges in Michigan, the Gravel Island and Green Bay National Wildlife Refuges in Wisconsin, and the Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge in Maine, as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3638. An act to extend for 3 years the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers for milk required to be withheld from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4739. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant long-term leases with respect to lands in the El Portal administrative site adjacent to Yosemite National Park, Calif., and for other purposes;

H.R. 13402. An act authorizing the use of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for chancery purposes;

H.R. 15562. An act to extend the expiration date of the act of September 19, 1966; and

H.R. 16065. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in deeds conveying certain lands to the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3102. An act to extend until November 1, 1970, the period for compliance with certain safety standards in the case of passenger vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 12, 1968, at 11 o'clock a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 18203. A bill to increase the size of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet

College, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 18299. A bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1968, signed at New York on March 21, 1968, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1259. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15067, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and related acts (Rept. No. 1705). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1260. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 18249, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended (Rept. No. 1706). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1261. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 945, an act to abolish the office of U.S. commissioner, to establish in place thereof within the judicial branch of the Government the office of U.S. magistrate, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1707). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 17144. A bill to establish a Commission on Hunger; with amendment (Rept. No. 1708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. S. 3710. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1722. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Jaffe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 1216. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 3736) entitled "A bill for the relief of Stephen H. Clarkson", to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code (Rept. No. 1691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7502. A bill for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden (Rept. No. 1692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8588. A bill for the relief of the Beasley Engineering Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 743. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 9826) entitled "A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvani" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code (Rept. No. 1694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judi-

ciary. House Resolution 954. Resolution referring the bill (H.R. 13642) to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims (Rept. No. 1695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1756. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Begnoche (Rept. No. 1696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3472. A bill for the relief of Walter A. Radeloff; with amendment (Rept. No. 1697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9567. A bill for the relief of Noel S. Marston; with amendment (Rept. No. 1698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13374. A bill for the relief of Sfc. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (retired); with amendment (Rept. No. 1699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14467. A bill for the relief of John Thomas Cosby, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 17109. A bill for the relief of Henry E. Dooley (Rept. No. 1701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1470. An act for the relief of the Ida group of mining claims in Josephine County, Ore. (Rept. No. 1702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 1034. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 18482. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, as amended, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain contracts entered into by the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 18483. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 18484. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 18485. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the granting of free transportation to guides or dog guides accompanying totally blind persons, and attendants of disabled persons requiring such attendants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 18486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of income from the operation of a communications satellite system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 18487. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 18488. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if certain relatives of such member died while serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 18489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a deduction from gross income for expenses of one visit annually between a member of the U.S. Armed Forces and his immediate family; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 18490. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 18491. A bill to amend title 10 of the

United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if certain relatives of such member died while serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 18492. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 18493. A bill to provide for the commemoration of the opening of the Cherokee Strip to homesteading, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 18494. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 18495. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1905, relating to the dumping of certain materials into the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 18496. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to the village of Central, State of New Mexico, certain lands administered by him formerly part of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 18497. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 18498. A bill to suspend percentage depletion allowances for oil and gas under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 30, 1968
For actions of July 29, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 133

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....3,22,35	Food for freedom.....37	Organization.....5,32
Buildings.....13	Food stamps.....1	Personnel.....4
CCC.....3	Foreign aid.....19	Poultry inspection.....14
Consumer affairs.....29	Forest Service.....35	Recreation.....9,24
Cotton.....7	Foreign trade.....7	Report.....27
Crop insurance.....16	Housing.....31	Research.....12
Education.....6,10	Hunger.....17,28	Retirement.....33
Employment.....10,31,34	Intergovernmental	Roads.....21,26
Farm program.....25	cooperation.....20	Rural development.....18
Federal aid.....23	Lands.....30	Taxation.....8,15,33
Fish and wildlife.....9	Loans.....36	Timber exports.....30
Fisheries.....11	Military training.....10	Transportation.....8
Flood control.....2	Oceanography.....12	World food.....17,28

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed poultry inspection bill. Senate adopted conference report on road authorization bill. Senate debated foreign aid authorization bill. Senate passed intergovernmental cooperation bill. House debated food stamp bill.

HOUSE

1. FOOD STAMPS. Began debate on H. R. 18249, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to increase the appropriation authorization for the fiscal year 1969 from \$225,000,000 to \$245,000,000. Rep. Sullivan offered an amendment to provide an open-end authorization for the fiscal years 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972. No action was taken on this amendment. pp. H7752-62

go along originally with the \$6 billion cut and talked about a \$4 billion cut, indicated his distaste for it. However, the President did sign this bill. About all we are seeing here today is what happens when an Executive does not want to make something work. I think this is what we all primarily should be keeping in mind, because facing our country is high inflation. It is still with us. It is going up at around a 5-percent rate a year now. Our international balance of payments is still in serious deficit. We have the highest interest rates since the Civil War. This country is in serious fiscal danger. The advice given was to cut expenditures, and even then we probably would have to have a tax increase.

As I pointed out on the floor during the tax increase debate, the fiscal year 1969 would begin within 4 days, namely on July 1 and this Executive was not about to cut \$6 billion during his remaining 6 months in office. One month of fiscal 1969 is now about past. Instead of cutting down from a \$186 billion to \$180 billion level, as required, the expenditure figures given are \$188.7 billion, having gone up almost \$2.5 billion. What we have is an Executive who has decided to demonstrate to the Congress that Congress is not going to push him around even though he signed the law. He is not about to cooperate and put his country first. This is what our difficulty is, and let us face it.

All right. The facts are there. You can groan on that side, but the facts are inescapable. An Executive that wanted to make this expenditure cut work could make it work.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service knows, I did agree that this matter should go to conference between the House and the Senate, and would have agreed to have it go without having the gentleman make the motion that is now on the floor.

Mr. DULSKI. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think that this problem ought to go to a conference where House and Senate conferees can sit down and perhaps make some adjustments. The conferees, in my opinion, ought to bear in mind that the conference report, which included a tax increase as recommended by the President, contained also a spending limitation of \$6 billion and the employment cutback as drafted. The employment cutback did not say that the Post Office Department or the FAA or any other department had to take a particular portion of the employment cutback.

It simply said that the executive branch of the Government over the period of fiscal year 1969 had to go back to the employment level of June 30, 1966. There was no identification, there was no specification of how this cutback departmentwise had to be achieved. I hope the conferees will bear in mind that there is flexibility under the existing law.

Second, I hope the conferees will take into consideration that under the conference report compromise, the Post Office Department can add new employees if they must in order to open up a new

post office, or if they have to in order to continue and I hope improve the mail services. Yes, there is flexibility both as to how the cutback shall be handled and how the departments, such as the post office—and maybe the FAA, that have a need can actually add employees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 1 additional minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that the chairman of the committee, and I hope to the conferees, that these are the matters that must be considered as they sit down to review the Senate version and the House version. There is ample flexibility for the conferees, and these matters are the things that should be considered before a final recommendation is made to the House as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the remarks of the distinguished minority leader I assure the gentleman that the conferees will bear in mind all the factors that are connected with this and come back with a bill that can be passed by the Congress.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, for an observation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to observe that the voting public is fairly sophisticated. I hope conferees will bring back a bill to close a certain post office. There will be pretty wide publicity on who voted how, and people who lose mail service will know how to vote in November. They are not as unsophisticated as they once were.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] for purposes of debate.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few observations that are perhaps repetitious, but which bear repetition. The reason the limitation is not flexible at all and that we gave recognition to the Post Office Department is that the Post Office Department has one-fourth of the employees in this country. If the Post Office Department does not carry its share of the cutback by administrative exception then many other agencies are going to have to carry a tremendously increased burden of the cutback.

What has been our history with the Post Office has been that we indeed need an increase in employees. We need an increase in the employees in the Post Office Department, and we always shall need an increase. It will never stop. Unless we get some kind of mechanization that is not in sight now, the need for increase in employment in the Post Office Department will not stop. We will need 15,000 additional employees for next year. The Committee on Appropriations brought in a bill, and we passed it, that provided for the dollars that would permit the Post Office Department to have 15,000 additional employees.

Then what is the allocation of the Post Office Department under the cut for the coming year? It is that the Post Office is being told to cut back 15,000 employees. That is what they will have to do if they are going to have to cut back by 1972 to the employment level of 1966, because that total number is more than 83,000 jobs to be cutback. We will need more than that many new jobs by 1972. We will undoubtedly need 100,000 additional employees in the Post Office Department by 1972, instead of a cutback of 83,000.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. This is a very important point. The gentleman knows there are 4 million more places receiving mail service today than in 1966—4 million new homes in subdivisions, 4 million new offices in the buildings, 4 million new places that need postal service.

Instead of getting them new employees, we are suggesting that they cut back by 30,000 employees, on the impact this year.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I merely wish to ask if either of the two gentlemen are aware of any study by the Department as to consolidating present services or making better use of existing personnel? Is this a one-way build up?

Mr. OLSEN. I can tell the gentleman they have to account for that sort of program annually to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Post Office Department, and they do.

Mr. DERWINSKI. But not with our committee?

Mr. OLSEN. Oh, they have with our committee, too. They had to do it when the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] who was chairman of the compensation hearings last year.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I wish the gentleman would make one more point clear to the House, because the suggestion was made here that there is no guarantee, if we go to conference and pass something like the Senate provision, that the Postmaster General will restore the cuts and take the action we suggest.

What is the gentleman's understanding on that point?

Mr. OLSEN. My understanding is—and it is an absolutely positive understanding, because all the services that were in the order of cutback have been postponed until August 3—that if this body concurs in the action of the other body all of the threatened curtailment will be restored.

I want to say further that the impact of this curtailment would be felt in the Congress. We will be next to feel it, because there is an election this year. The temporary employees who would be necessary to handle the great volume of election mail in September and October cannot be hired. They could not be hired.

As a matter of fact, we would have a cutback in August and in September and

in October and in every month. That is what we would face at election time.

Also, at Christmas time, the temporary employees could not be hired.

What would be the alternative? The alternative would be that regular employees would have to work overtime. If they were not sufficient enough to handle that mail by their overtime, then the mail would be delayed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. OLSEN. I want to say again that all of the threatened curtailment would be restored. I made that inquiry especially because of my situation, having so many rural third- and fourth-class post offices. That was my inquiry, and that was the answer I got, positively.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General has no alternative to a reduction in services because of the employment ceiling. He has not threatened blackmail. He has complied with the law. He has announced the steps he will take to fulfill the specific objectives required by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act. It is the opinion of our committee, which has the legislative responsibility for postal operations, that the postal service should be exempted from the ceiling.

[Mr. BOLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DULSKI, HENDERSON, OLSEN, CORBETT, and GROSS.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. July 26, 1968.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As the vital and important initial work of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has been completed with hearings conducted, recommendations made, report filed and the Code of Ethics recommended by the Committee adopted by the House, and with the Committee's future work being largely concerned with enforcement of the Code of Ethics, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee to be effective August 1 next.

Thank you for the honor of giving me the privilege of serving on this committee.

With kindest regards and highest esteem, I am

Sincerely your friend,

JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16361, ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16361) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMILLAN, DOWDY, WHITENER, FUQUA, NELSEN, BROYHILL of Virginia, and HARSHA.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 291 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 285 on July 25, the industrial fund vote, I was necessarily absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

INCREASE IN 1969 AUTHORIZATION FOR FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG], I call up House Resolution 1260 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1260

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18249) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 18249, the Committee on Agriculture shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3068, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 18249 as passed by the House.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield all of my time to the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] for taking my place while I was on the telephone.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1260 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 18249 to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended. The resolution further provides that, after passage of the House bill, the Committee on Agriculture shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 3068 and it shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and amend it with the House-passed language.

The food stamp program was devised as an additional means of raising the level of nutrition in economically needy households.

Stamps provide the low-income family with a means of a wider, more varied diet. They incorporate the self-help principle. They utilize the best food distribution system in the world, our commercial marketing complex.

H.R. 18249 is needed to permit orderly growth of the program, and should be expanded and increased to increase further the effectiveness of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1260 in order that H.R. 18249 may be considered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MARTIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] has explained, House Resolution 1260 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 18249, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, the bill simply increases the maximum appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1969 from \$225 million to \$245 million, an increase of \$20 million. In addition, Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments to the present law which I feel are very fine amendments and which should be supported as reported out of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the committee voted to prohibit the use of food stamps to support participants in voluntary work stoppages or labor disputes. There was also testimony that usage of stamps by college students was being permitted in some jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the original intent and purposes of the food stamp program, the acute need to stretch the funds of the Government to reach as many of the needy as possible and the adequacy of other resources, public and private, if they help students and participants in industrial disagreements, the

committee voted to prohibit the use of stamps either to aid education or to aid and support industrial disputes. The amendments were modified so that any person eligible for stamps or not, by virtue of becoming involved in labor dispute or entering an institution of higher learning, without any other change of condition, be disqualified from continuing to obtain necessary nutritional assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and I support the bill as reported out of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18249) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 18249, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, continuing the policy suggested by the Honorable Milo Perkins during the early 1930's, the Committee on Agriculture offers a bill which, if adopted, would serve to further improve the diets of the less fortunate in America. Started once prior to World War II and abandoned, the use of stamps which may be exchanged for groceries is not a new approach to the problems of those persons in need of additional purchasing power to obtain the necessities of life. Regardless of its age, the food stamp program, when used wisely, greatly improves the diets of the participants. We feel this measure properly administered and funded will fill the legitimate needs that exist, and we believe that the bill proposed by the committee would provide for the kind of sound program growth which would avoid a second abandonment of the program.

Contrary to the belief of some persons, the Agriculture Department, and the Agriculture Committee, have been genuinely concerned and involved with the problem of hunger in this country for many years. We have for more than three decades worked, and I feel successfully, at the job of passing legislation which would feed the hungry. Beginning with the distribution by the Red Cross

in 1932 of flour and continuing through the end of fiscal 1967, this committee has overseen the administration of relief programs by the Department of Agriculture which have distributed food in an amount totaling \$9,295,000,000. At the present these programs account for the feeding of 6.1 million Americans in 2,400 counties. All of this increase in Federal expenditures for domestic feeding has taken place while the national unemployment rate was steadily declining from 6 percent to 4 percent.

Briefly, as background, consider some of our earlier Federal feeding programs, including the beginning of food stamps. It was during the great depression of the 1930's that our Federal Government's feeding programs began. The Red Cross, as mentioned earlier, distributed flour which was milled from wheat purchased and donated to that agency by the old Federal Farm Board. During the early days of the Roosevelt administration, the Federal Government began purchasing commodities and giving them to the States for distribution.

From an initial distribution of food valued at \$32 million worth of commodities during fiscal 1936 until the enactment of the school lunch program in fiscal 1946, the food so donated by the Department of Agriculture totaled \$512.7 million.

In 1936, the U.S. Comptroller General disputed the authority claimed under section 32. The Congress enacted Public Law 440 which gave clear direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to make such purchases and donations. Using the welfare applications of the section, as broadened by amendment, the Department of Agriculture instituted a food stamp program in 1939.

Then as now eligible persons bought stamps with that portion of their incomes normally expended on food. The stamps that were bought were orange. At the same time of the purchase, the participants received blue stamps which were free. The orange stamps were redeemed at local retail stores for general food products of a greater value than the money for which the stamps were sold. The free blue stamps were redeemed at the stores for foods currently in surplus.

From a rather small beginning in Rochester, N.Y., in 1939, the plan spread to five other experimental areas. By May of 1941, 4 million persons were receiving assistance. By August of 1942, 1,741 counties and 88 cities were included. Declining unemployment during the war years led to termination of the stamp program in 1943.

While the food stamps were getting underway, the Agriculture Department by enactment of Public Law 159 in 1939, received more specific authority for donations of food to low-income groups. Each of the various agriculture acts passed thereafter appropriated sums of money to augment the distribution programs.

The so-called penny milk program started in 1940 allowed schools to purchase milk from local producers for sale to students at a cost of 1 cent per half pint. The schools were reimbursed by the Department of Agriculture. This con-

tinued until 1943 when milk became available under the auspices of Public Law 129 through the school lunch program. From that time on more and more foods were utilized in schools and child care other than just surplus.

An attempt to revive the stamp program was made by amending Public Law 480 on the floor in 1959. The permissive 2 year national food stamp plan authorizing the distribution of \$250 million worth of food per year to needy persons in the United States was never utilized. The authority expired in January of 1962.

President Kennedy in his economic message to the Congress in February of 1961 announced a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate a pilot food stamp program under the 1935 act. Because of the imminent expiration of the permissive amendment, precedents established in 1935 under section 32 were used as authority.

The first pilot project was in McDowell County, W. Va. It opened May 25, 1961, and within 1 month seven additional pilot projects were established.

From these meager beginnings, the pilot food stamp program of 49,640 participants has grown until at the end of fiscal 1967 it encompassed 838 areas with 1.8 million participants.

Many of you recall the passage of the Food Stamp Act of 1964. H.R. 10222, the committee bill, was introduced as a result of the hearings involving more than 40 witnesses before our committee.

On the floor seven major amendments were proposed and two of those adopted. Major controversy centered on amendments to require States to pay 50 percent of the value of the free food stamps issued within each State. This amendment failed. The act was passed by a vote of 229 to 189. Afterward, on the same day but not before as some Members have thought, the House passed the wheat-cotton bill.

I would point out to the House that food stamps are not considered partisan now as they were at that time. The recent encampment and the stir in the press and on television about the starvation claimed to exist may have caused many to change their original position on the subject. Mine has not changed, nor has the position of the members of the Agriculture Committee. We still believe in the food stamp program but we also believe in responsible government. We believe this bill to be in that vein.

H.R. 18249 increases the amount authorized to be spent for food stamps from \$225,000,000 in fiscal 1969 to \$245,000,000. This increase is in keeping with the message of February 28, 1968, from the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Speaker. As was pointed out in the letter, the program had increased by December 1967, to include 1,239 designated areas. The new designations, made from the 1968 fiscal year appropriation of \$185 million, were expected to bring total participation to 2,750,000 persons by June 30, 1968. The Secretary felt that the maximum authorized appropriation authority for the fiscal year 1969 would be required, \$225 million, to continue a program at the 2,750,000-person level. He felt that a \$20 million increase in ap-

propriation authority would be sufficient to move forward in line with the President's recommendations contained in his budget message. Our committee was further advised in this letter that the Bureau of the Budget was in accord with the program of the President. As far as I can determine, that is still the position of the Budget Bureau.

A bill which I introduced, H.R. 15896, was considered by our committee. This bill provided simply for the \$20 million increase, in line with the request, nothing more. There were a number of other bills considered, including seven or eight sponsored by the gentlewoman from Missouri and some 100 or more other Members.

In his appearance before the committee last month the Secretary of Agriculture announced his support for the bill as offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri. His explanation was that requests for new areas required substantial additional funding. It was admitted by the Secretary, however, that his new proposal did not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and that he did not know whether or not the legislation he had endorsed was consonant with the program of the President.

As a result of the hearings, the committee in its deliberations decided to report the amount of \$20 million as the Secretary requested in his original letter.

The bill I introduced did nothing except provide additional funds for the food stamp program. It changed no policies. It related solely to funding and not to philosophy. I recognize that there are many changes which various individuals would like to make but I felt that it was unwise to let the discussion become involved in collateral policy arguments. I, therefore, opposed any amendments in the committee, including those which are now written into the bill.

Two amendments were offered by our friends on the minority side and were approved by a majority of the members of the committee and are now included in the clean bill which is before us. Without taking any position on the merits of the amendments, I would say to the House, as I have said to the committee, that it seems to me to be desirable to keep this issue clear and simply one of additional funding.

I would emphasize to the House that the bill we present, if given an appropriation up to the limit authorized, would result in an increase in funding of almost one-third over fiscal 1968. The amount appropriated for food stamps in 1968 was \$185 million; we authorize \$245 million for 1969. If the full amount is appropriated, it will increase spending by \$60 million. In addition just last week, we provided an additional \$45 million of section 32 funds. These are also agricultural funds and they are to be spent in giving more food to certain people.

Food stamps were available to needy persons in 1,027 areas at the time the committee held hearings in June of 1968. Assuming that the administration of the program is handled in such a manner as to obtain the maximum return for each dollar spent, the committee believes that

we have provided sufficient authority to meet the needs of the country in this area. We, therefore, request the favorable consideration by the House of H.R. 18249.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 18249, a bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the food stamp program by \$20 million for fiscal year 1969.

I introduced this bill on the first of July at the direction of the House Committee on Agriculture, and it contains two sections.

Section 1 represents the administration's request submitted to the committee in February of this year. It provides for an increase in the food stamp authorization from \$225 to \$245 million, and is identical to the bill passed earlier this year by the other body and an earlier bill introduced by the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Section 2 reflects amendments adopted by the Agriculture Committee. The first deals with the eligibility of strikers for participation in the food stamp program. The second deals with students attending institutions of higher learning.

The purpose of these amendments is to keep the program as close as possible to the original intent of the Congress in establishing it as a means of reaching the involuntarily poor.

These two amendments prohibit the use of food stamps either to aid education or to support industrial disputes. They do not, however, prevent students or those engaged in strikes, labor disputes or voluntary work stoppages from participating in the program if they were eligible for and were actually receiving food stamps beforehand.

In adopting these two amendments, the committee took into consideration the original intent and purposes of the food stamp program, the acute need to stretch the funds of Government to reach as many of the needy as possible, and the adequacy of other resources—public and private—to help students and participants in industrial disagreements.

As is pointed out in our committee report, the food stamp program was devised as an additional means of raising the level of nutrition in economically needy households. It was envisioned as an aid to families on welfare; the unemployed, the aged, blind, disabled, and mothers with dependent children. It was designed to serve the persons on small pensions, the unemployed, the underemployed, and the unskilled.

It would be possible, of course, to devise a food stamp program to reduce the cost of food to all Americans, but the expense of such a program would be astronomical, and certainly there is no justification for using public funds to reduce the cost of food to those who are capable of earning enough to buy it. The question, then, becomes one of where to draw the line, and it is up to Congress to keep the guidelines clear. Is the food

stamp program to be directed primarily toward the involuntarily poor, or should those who become poor by choice be included as well. I, for one, support the Agriculture Committee's position that the primary purpose of the program should be to meet the needs of those who are involuntarily poor.

In a letter dated February 28 of this year to the Speaker of the House, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman stated that a \$20 million "increase in the 1969 appropriation authority is necessary if we are to continue in an orderly way to extend the availability of food assistance to the poor," and that "without an increase in appropriation authority the program could not move forward."

This legislation is designed to meet the need represented by that request, and if it is approved and the full funds are authorized, an increase of \$60 million—almost a one-third increase—would be realized in the food stamp program in fiscal year 1969.

Although we are in a period of fiscal crisis, forced to cut back or at least hold the line on most Federal programs, I feel that this increase in authorization is both justifiable and necessary.

The substitute of the gentlelady from Missouri would strike out all after the enacting clause in the committee bill and extend the program for 3 years beyond June 30, 1969, without any legislative ceiling on expenditures. It also calls for an annual report by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The adoption of the substitute is not desirable in my opinion because:

The committee bill contains a substantial increase in funds for the food stamp program—\$20 million plus \$40 million additional funds carried in the fiscal year 1969 appropriations bill actually provides \$60 million more for the program in fiscal year 1969 than in fiscal year 1968;

The level of spending in the committee bill was recommended by the administration and approved by the Budget Bureau in February 1968;

The substitute would remove any statutory restraint on the level of expenditures for this program which, under the committee bill, would be funded at a rate of nearly a quarter of a billion dollars annually;

The substitute would drastically increase spending beyond levels approved by the administration and the Budget Bureau earlier this year;

The substitute would permit food stamp aid to college students;

The substitute would permit the food stamp program to be used as a subsidy for strikes and labor disputes; and

The substitute was considered in the committee and rejected by a 26-to-4 record vote.

Legislation to establish the food stamp program originally came from the House Agriculture Committee, and as the program has proven itself, the committee from time to time has recommended legislation to increase its scope and funding authorization. It has been contended that the House Agriculture Committee has been hostile to the food stamp program, but in response to that contention I would just call attention to the fact that

the program has steadily been expanded to the point where now more than two and a half million persons are being served in over one thousand counties.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this legislation merits our support, and I urge my colleagues to approve it as recommended by the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fairness displayed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] in permitting me to have a portion of the half hour allotted to the majority side for general debate on the pending food stamp legislation. I am not a member of the committee handling the bill; furthermore, for the first time since 1957, a food stamp measure being considered in the House is not a bill carrying my name. Under the circumstances, I do want to express my appreciation for having time allotted to me, and for that I thank the chairman not only for myself but for the 129 other Members of this House who joined me in introducing the legislation which the Committee on Agriculture rejected 26 to 4 before voting out H.R. 18249, the bill now before us.

H.R. 18249 is a completely inadequate bill. It purports to permit some expansion of the food stamp program, but it is my understanding that every cent of additional appropriations it would authorize has already been committed in advance to a limited number of counties scheduled to start the program in the next 2 months. Hundreds of other counties which want the program, and have formally requested it, and are waiting in line for funds to enable them to come into it, will not be able to start food stamping programs during this fiscal year—or even—under the committee bill we are now considering.

No one has been a greater supporter of the food stamp idea since 1957 than the Speaker of the House of Representatives, yet his beloved city of Boston, which wants this program, cannot be admitted to it under the bill we are considering. Most of the members of the New York City delegation have gone down the line on teller votes with me, and voted with me on the rollell votes, on the food stamp bills since 1957, yet their city could not possibly be admitted to the program under this bill. Springfield, Mass., and Cambridge, Pittsfield, Quincy, Revere, and Dracut, Mass., cannot come in, although they have applied; in Pennsylvania, whose Congressmen have always given the overwhelming majority of their votes to the food stamp program, there are Berks, Delaware, Monroe, Northampton, Butler, Cameron, Centre, Elk, Forest, Warren, Lancaster, and York counties all waiting, patiently, hat in hand, you might say, for the Congress to let them participate in a program which Pennsylvania, probably more than any other State, helped to prove was feasible and provided the votes to get it enacted into law; Alameda and Monterey and

Sacramento Counties in California are left out by this committee bill; so are 35 counties in Illinois, all of which had been ready to start this program during this very month if the funds had been available; there are 23 such counties in Michigan, and numerous others in Ohio, South Carolina, Alaska, Louisiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Nebraska, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Tennessee, North Carolina—read the list in Saturday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages E6728-E6729—hundreds of areas anxious to use this means to help their low-income families obtain good, American-style diets at very little cost to the Federal Government.

But this bill will not help any of those counties or the poor people in them. This measure is not a bill to expand the food stamp program but one which would limit expansion to a comparative few small counties scattered throughout the country.

That is why, when the bill is opened for amendment, I will immediately move to amend it, by offering, as a substitute, the bill sponsored by 130 Members of the House—probably the highest number of sponsors of any bill introduced in the House. And while the Committee on Agriculture saw fit to reject that legislation by a vote of 26 to 4, I think the House itself will reverse that action. I know it will do so if the Members make sure to be present when the teller vote takes place, soon after the end of general debate.

There are three points of view seeking House approval in this debate. One represents the attitude of about a third of the members of the Committee on Agriculture that the food stamp program is the worst idea in the agricultural field ever brought before Congress. A dozen or more members of that committee, who joined enthusiastically in adding silly amendments to this bill, then voted against the bill anyway, even with those amendments. This is what they did last year also, when they tried to gut the program with a requirement that the States shoulder 20 percent of the cost of the stamps. Many of them who were here in 1964 voted then for the 50-percent sharing requirement added by the committee at that time, and then still voted against it in committee even after that amendment was adopted.

Most of the other members of the Committee on Agriculture have a somewhat different view. It is that the food stamp program probably isn't a very good idea, but they need the votes of the urban members on farm legislation, so they might as well vote out some kind of a bill. And that's what they did in this instance.

Finally, there is the viewpoint shared by 130 of us who sponsored H.R. 17721 and its identical companion measures—and also shared by the four members of the Committee on Agriculture who voted for our bill in committee. That viewpoint is that the food stamp program is the best plan we have yet devised for making it possible for all Americans, no matter how poor, to eat properly in a Nation which enjoys such an abundance of food production.

Let me give the Members just one set of comparative figures, and then we can get on to the voting:

The average Federal subsidy to the 2,500,000 persons participating in the food stamp program in nearly 1,100 counties across the country is \$6.73 per person per month. Most of the cost of food stamps is paid by the people participating in the program, not by Uncle Sam.

On the other hand, the average cost to the Federal Government of giving out free food to the 3,322,000 persons now getting monthly free handouts of cornmeal, powdered eggs, dried milk, peanut butter, and so on—a shamefully inadequate diet for those who try to live on it—is \$11 per month.

In other words, it costs the taxpayers nearly twice as much to dump surplus food handouts on poor people than to let them buy a proper, nutritious diet in the neighborhood grocery store. The participants in the food stamp program pay two-thirds of the cost of their food stamps. Which is the better program? Ask anyone who has tried both.

The answer you will get from the people who have tried both programs will be far different from the answer you get from many of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, who say that the direct handout program is wonderful but that the food stamp program is a terrible burden on the farmer.

How is it a burden on the farmer? Well, their answer seems to be that if we do not have all of these poor people on whom we can dump peanut butter and cornmeal, there may not be sufficient outlet for the farm surpluses we pay to take off the market.

That is as far as they can see.

H.R. 18249 is a 1-year bill, for this year only. If we pass it in this form, we will have to fight this same battle all over again next year, just in order to keep the food stamp program in operation in the areas which now have it. There may not be a farm bill to bargain over next year.

If we adopt my substitute, which provides for a 4-year open-end authorization, the Committee on Agriculture can still go into this program next year, or every week or month for the next 4 years, to recommend changes or amendments. What the committee seems to want is the annual privilege of killing the food stamp program by taking no action at all. All of the members who believe the committee should have the affirmative right to review any program under its jurisdiction, but not kill a good program merely by inaction, will support my substitute amendment, an amendment sponsored by 130 Members, including 10 chairmen of standing committees and four ranking minority members of standing committees.

Certainly the 130 of us who joined in sponsoring the 4-year bill are not rebels against the committee system in the House. We believe in it. But a committee which consistently seeks to destroy a good program which the overwhelming majority of the House supports cannot expect to hold an annual life-and-death power over such a program, nor should

it retain the chance to do so. I urge your support for the substitute bill.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have never tried to tell any Member of this House of Representatives how to vote and I do not resent for 1 minute the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] trying to amend this particular bill. I have never felt that I had the answer for anyone other than my own vote and my own conscience.

Mr. Chairman, if the majority of the House wants to support the amendment on tomorrow, that will be perfectly all right with me. However, I have felt that I cannot support this amendment and one fact in justifying that position is the fact that I had just voted on a tax bill which called for a \$6 billion cut in appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, this bill already has had a built-in additional sum for this year of \$40 million. \$185 million was spent last year.

Last year, \$185 million was spent. Automatically it went to \$225 million, but I thought in view of the severe cuts that are going to have to be made in the other appropriation bills that that was as much as we in good conscience could vote toward this particular bill. This bill is moving at a pretty rapid pace, and it is going to continue in my opinion to move at that pace, just like every other program that has started, \$185 million, \$245 million if the House Committee on Agriculture is sustained, or the Lord only knows how much money if the amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri is agreed to by the House.

The Secretary of Agriculture has said that if the amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri is sustained, that he will ask for approximately \$100 million in place of \$20 million. He has further said that to actually put this food-stamp bill in operation throughout the country it will take \$1.5 billion.

I feel that a lot of times these programs progress too fast in order to do an efficient job. This program, as I say, is progressing pretty rapidly. I feel that if too much money is poured into the program it will not be as efficiently an operated program as it would be if we look at and eliminate those things that are bad about the program and continue those things which are good.

One of the reasons why the food-stamp plan is catching on is that the Government pays the entire bill. We have tried to put in an amendment that the States would pay part of this bill, feeling that if the States put up part of this money they would be a little more careful as to who they certified. I know State governments, county governments, and local governments well enough to know they are going to shove everything they possibly can onto the food-stamp plan in order to save whatever funds they have for some other program. That is only natural.

We have had cost sharing in almost every program that we have had in the Federal Government, and we feel that where the local people and the Federal Government work in cooperation and in partnership that this results in more efficient operation of the program, and it is for the interest of the local people to see that only the proper people are actually certified for this program.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I had hoped the gentleman would yield just on that point because, while the States do not pay any of the costs of these stamps, they do pay a substantial share of the administrative costs and the people themselves pay for about two-thirds of the cost of the stamps—62 percent of the cost of the food stamps is paid for by the participants.

I want to give you the total cost first for the entire country. The first 9 months of fiscal year 1968, the people who participate paid \$226 million of their own money for \$368 million worth of stamps. That is 62 percent of the total. In this way, they increased their food purchases by at least \$142 million; and that is the \$142 million that the Federal Government paid while those other people who are participants paid \$226 million of their own money. But every cent of the \$368 million legally could be spent only for food and nothing but food.

Mr. BELCHER. The only thing that a person does to participate is that they just use the same amount of money that they now spend for food anyway, and get free stamps for the part that the Government puts in. So I do not see how the gentlewoman can say that a person, because they spend so much money of their own for food, are participating in the food-stamp plan. The food-stamp plan is to supplement what they are already spending. These people, as the gentlewoman says, spent \$226 million, and they probably have had to spend \$368 million if the Federal Government had not paid for it as part of their grocery bill.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. This is why I have constantly emphasized that it is not a giveaway program. This is a program to give low income people a more adequate diet because they cannot by the food that is necessary for an adequate diet on the amount of money that they have to spend on food. They could not have spent \$368 million of their own money for food—not possibly. Chances are that they wouldn't have spent the \$226 million either—but they had to do so in order to get the extra help.

Mr. BELCHER. I do not care how worthy the purpose may be but the Federal Government will be giving \$245 million away under the committee bill. Is that not correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct, \$245 million worth of food in the grocery stores, for which much, much more than

that would have to be spent by the people themselves out of their own money.

Mr. BELCHER. Now you can call that a giveaway or a grant of anything else, but it is \$245 million that the Federal Government gives to somebody without absolutely no return from the participants. What would you call it, if it is not a giveaway program?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It is not a giveaway program because to get something the participants have to give something of their own—a sizable percentage of their income that they can then spend only for food and nothing else.

Mr. BELCHER. They do not have to give anything. They just go down to the grocery store and if they are going to spend \$12 for groceries, they will get a certain amount added to that and the stamps will be given to them.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. How do they get the stamps, if I may ask the gentleman?

Mr. BELCHER. They get the stamps simply because the Government pays a part of it and they pay a part of it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Well, that is it—they have to pay their share—the amount they are expected to spend for food and nothing else. Many of them pay out more for the stamps than they actually would spend for food; it is a nutrition program.

Mr. BELCHER. If they did not buy the stamps, they would have to buy their groceries.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right—unless they have been “living on the commodities,” as they call it, and not buying much food—using their food money for other things. The people we are talking about do not have enough money to buy the groceries and the food necessary for an adequate diet that they need. That is why they qualify for this program.

Mr. BELCHER. But it is a giveaway program. Maybe it is a good giveaway program. Maybe it is the best giveaway program that we have ever devised. But most certainly, you cannot say it is not a Government giveaway program.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It is a self-help program.

Mr. BELCHER. All right, then; we will say it is a self-help program but nevertheless the Government gives the money.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS. I wonder if the gentlewoman might have some statistics about the difference in value that the individual puts in. What assurance do you have that they really spend that much extra money? It is not altogether possible that they spend less money now of their own than they spend drinking beer someplace?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will let the gentleman ready my mail, if the gentleman will kindly yield and if I may just answer him, I would say, of course, people would rather pay nothing because they would much rather spend that money for something different. But I have just cited a figure showing what they do pay out of their own pockets under this program. The criticism has been that too often participants must pay more for food coupons than they would normally have spent for food.

Mr. BELCHER. Under the present operation of the Government and the Department of Agriculture, you only have to pay 50 cents a month for your grocery bill.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If the gentleman will permit me, I am certain the gentleman knows that these are in extremely poor areas where the people have no money at all.

Mr. BELCHER. All right, but nevertheless they do not have to pay but 50 cents to get the food stamps; is that not correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. They have to put up at least 50 cents a month per person or \$3 per family, where the family income is less than \$20 a month.

Mr. BELCHER. Now let us say that a participant or a person who put up 50 cents was paying for this food-stamp plan given to them by the Department of Agriculture and in addition to that the Secretary of Agriculture is contemplating not charging them anything and sooner or later there will not be a charge to anybody in this program because when it started out, they were going to pay a certain percentage and it has gone down and down and now until it has gotten down to 50 cents per month. Certainly, you cannot claim that a person who puts up 50 cents a month on their grocery bill for participating in a Government program is paying for the program.

Mr. MYERS. Is it not a fact that the Office of Economic Opportunity in some areas puts up the 50 cents and the people do not even put up that much?

Mr. BELCHER. I suppose that is probably true.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will put in the RECORD these percentage figures which show that in the State of Connecticut the participants pay 68 percent of the cost and the Government pays the balance.

In Washington, D.C., the participants pay 60 percent; in New York the participants pay 71 percent; in Vermont 69 percent.

When we get down to the lower income areas—North Carolina—the participants pay 53 percent, that is on the average. South Carolina they pay 40 percent. Georgia they pay 52 percent and in Alabama they pay 44 percent.

Here are the figures for the various States—the average for each State—on the percentage of the cost of the food coupons paid for by the participating families. On the average, the people themselves pay 62 percent of the value of the food stamps. But this varies by States depending on the number of very low-income families participating.

In Mississippi, for instance, the families participating in this program pay only 39 percent of the cost of the stamps and the Federal Government pays the rest, while in Michigan and Illinois the people pay 73 percent and the Federal Government pays only 27 percent.

Nationally, as I said, the Government pays 38 percent and the people participating pay 62 percent. But here is the breakdown by States and regions:

Average percentage of cost of food stamps paid by participants

1. Northeast region (64%):	Percent
Connecticut	68
District of Columbia	60
Maine	68
Maryland	60
New Jersey	61
New York	71
Pennsylvania	67
Rhode Island	67
Vermont	69
West Virginia	64

(During the first nine months of the 1968 fiscal year, participants paid \$60 million for \$93 million worth of coupons.)

2. Southeast region (46%):	Percent
Alabama	44
Georgia	52
Kentucky	51
Mississippi	39
North Carolina	53
South Carolina	40
Tennessee	48
Virginia	46

(During the first nine months of the 1968 fiscal year, participants paid \$35 million for \$75 million worth of coupons.)

3. Midwest region (67%):	Percent
Illinois	73
Indiana	65
Iowa	65
Michigan	73
Minnesota	69
Missouri	57
Nebraska	66
North Dakota	48
Ohio	64
* South Dakota	36
Wisconsin	64

* First month's operation only, when stamps are provided to all applicants at half the normal payment requirement.

(During the first nine months of the 1968 fiscal year, participants paid \$79 million for \$116 million worth of coupons.)

4. Southwest region (53%):	Percent
Arkansas	49
Colorado	61
Kansas	68
Louisiana	53
New Mexico	53
Texas	49

(During the first nine months of the 1968 fiscal year, participants paid \$19 million for \$36 million worth of coupons.)

5. Western region (67%):	Percent
Alaska	44
California	69
Hawaii	68
Montana	58
Oregon	67
Utah	68
Washington	65
Wyoming	65

(During the first nine months of the 1968 fiscal year, participants paid \$33 million for \$48 million worth of coupons.)

Mr. BELCHER. What the gentlewoman is saying there is that they pay 51 percent of their own grocery bill; is that not so?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No, they pay 51 percent or more of the total amount of money that is spent, by using the stamps, and including their own money.

Mr. BELCHER. That is they pay 51 percent of their own grocery bill and the Government pays 49 percent. There is no other way to figure it because the Government puts up 49 percent and the individual puts up 51 percent, and the individual gets all the groceries; is that not correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is right. They

receive more in food coupons than they spend for the coupons.

Mr. BELCHER. So they pay 51 percent of their grocery bill. Maybe that is a good thing—it may be good for everybody in the United States. You know pretty soon they are all going to be able to qualify on these food-stamp plans and it may be good for the Government to pay the grocery bill of every individual but nevertheless I would call it in the first place, and I want it thoroughly understood that this is a give-away program of the Federal Government and that it is going up from \$185 million to \$245 million—\$100 million extra there and \$1,500,000,000 before the program is over.

After a big majority of the Members of the House have voted for the tax bill, and after a big majority of the Members of the House have voted a \$6-billion cut in expenditures among all the other agencies, if a majority of this House want to buy the idea of spending \$100 million extra on this particular program, it is all right with me, and I will take my hat off to one of the finest salesmen in this House, the gentlewoman from Missouri, in adding an extra \$100 million to this program at the very time when everyone else is getting a cut.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The gentleman will remember the debate, I believe it was in 1964, shortly after St. Louis first came into this program, changing from direct distribution to the food-stamp program. At that time approximately 50,000 persons were getting free food under the direct distribution program. When we changed over to the food stamps, that number dropped down to about 1,000 persons the first month. Of course, it was made to sound like quite a scandal. It was even used in the debate here. We were asked, "What on earth is wrong with the food-stamp program when you have only 1,000 participants out of 50,000 poor people?" By the time we went into this thing we found that many people did not understand what it was to pay their own money for food; many of them came up with the answer: "Why should I pay for food stamps when I was getting food free?" They were not thinking about what was best for the health of the family, and particularly of the children.

But today, when people understand this program and when they are actually certified—and they are certified as to income eligibility every 3 months—we now have some 23,000 persons participating, compared to the 1,000 the first month we started. This program will expand as more people understand the program and as people continue to have low incomes which are insufficient to enable them to eat properly.

Mr. BELCHER. As far as the American people are concerned, when they find that they can get someone to pay their grocery bills for them, I think you will find that this program will expand a lot faster than you anticipate. The Secretary of Agriculture said he will be able to spend \$1.5 billion in a short time. In my opinion it will be several times that \$1.5 billion if all the American peo-

ple find out that they can get somebody to pay for their groceries.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. I would like to ask the gentlewoman about a statement in which earlier she charged that in the Committee on Agriculture a couple of silly amendments were offered.

The two amendments that were offered in the committee were those which would prohibit people who were actively engaged in a work stoppage from receiving assistance and those college students going to college from receiving assistance. Do you really think the taxpayers of this country should directly support the college students through the food-stamp program? Do you think you are helping the nutrition of this country, if that is the intent, by giving food stamps to people who are on strike or to various others whose nutrition, you feel, the taxpayers should raise? Is that the purpose and the reason why you call the amendments "silly amendments"?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would ask you this question: Are we working on legislation primarily intended to provide benefits for strikers or for "hippies"? That is what the discussion in the committee seemed to indicate. Some of the hippies in some of the areas of the country were getting food stamps because they had no other means of getting food. They would not work. But the program was not introduced primarily for people like that. It is intended for people who have low incomes and not enough food. As for strikers, many times a strike is forced on a person through no fault of his own, and he does not have sufficient money to feed his family. He cannot participate in this program if he has money or assets, stocks and bonds. He cannot have a bank account. He cannot have liquid assets. If he has, and if these assets are above the low maximum amounts, he will not get the stamps.

Mr. MYERS. Why is a recipient prohibited from having those things?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Why?

Mr. MYERS. You said that he cannot have them. Why can he not have them?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. He does not get the food stamps if he has any significant assets, and he probably has not had the earnings to acquire stocks and bonds and substantial savings, or, if he did, he has to wait until he has used them up before he can get help under this program.

Mr. MYERS. Do not the labor people take care of those people? What about college students?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield no further. I have yielded two-thirds of my time to the gentlewoman from Missouri in the last debate, and I yielded her 10 minutes at the very beginning.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to say I am going to support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] tomorrow, and I would like to have all the Members here, although I would like to say to my

colleagues that I would not describe any amendment as silly. It is just a descriptive adjective that has been applied. The gentlewoman from Missouri calls the amendment silly. I would not have voted for the amendments had I been on the committee, because I have lived in an area where I have seen strikes, and I have seen people set on the streets, and I have seen people try to live on sowbelly and beans for months on end—one has to come to an area like that to really appreciate what food stamps have done.

As far as college students, we are willing to give them money to go to college. Maybe there are a few abuses. I am the first to admit probably there have been. But I know from every statistic we have ever seen that when a boy or girl gets out of college, he is a great deal better citizen and he can contribute more to the economy.

I will support the amendment tomorrow, and I hope others do.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri. Mrs. SULLIVAN's substitute will provide authorization for the important food stamp program through fiscal year 1972. The proposed substitute would incorporate the language of seven identical bills, one of which I cosponsored as did 129 other Members of this body, to provide authorization for the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to fully implement the food stamp program throughout the Nation.

The present bill which was reported by the members of the Agriculture Committee would place a statutory limitation of \$245 million for the food stamp program during fiscal year 1969. Yet less than 1 month ago, the Secretary of Agriculture testified that it would take at least \$325 million to carry out the program in such a manner as to assure that no truly disadvantaged American suffers malnutrition.

Mr. Chairman, there are now 1,027 counties and independent cities throughout the Nation participating in the food stamp program. At this time there are at least 239 additional areas—areas that have been waiting since last December—awaiting adequate funds to initiate the food stamp program. As of July 1, there were 115 counties which have been fully certified as being capable of implementing an efficient and effective program to meet very real and serious problems of hunger; yet it appears extremely likely that these 115 areas will participate unless we adopt the so-called Sullivan substitute. In my State of Alaska we have seven such areas—Anchorage, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Juneau, Ketchikan, Nome, and Seward.

Of these seven Alaskan areas, there are a number which have Alaskan natives who live for the most part in isolated villages in conditions of abject poverty which, fortunately, is not duplicated elsewhere in the United States. In 1960, the median annual income for the nonwhite Alaskan family was less than \$3,400 and

many families do not earn even \$1,000 a year. Based upon the assurances of the Secretary of Agriculture late this last spring, the Alaska State Legislature appropriated and spent \$50,000 for April, May, and June to prepare to expand the critically needed food stamp program throughout the State. In addition, the Alaska State Legislature appropriated \$246 to implement the food stamp program this year. Now we are told that there is not sufficient money to carry out this program for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from Missouri for her forthright manner in keeping this vital program in proper perspective. I urge adoption of the so-called Sullivan substitute.

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposition presented by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

I, too, have lived in areas where we have had strikes. As a matter of fact, we had an 8-month-long strike. All of the members of the family did not vote for the strike, nor did all of the male heads of households, head of families, vote for strike. But they were outside the fence, and the mines and mills were shut down, and they all desperately needed the food stamp help. Thank God they had it.

Those poor human beings—I do not know what would have happened to them otherwise because they were outside the fence and were out for 8 months. They were outside for a lot of other reasons than a strike. They were outside the fence because of the cost of copper, and because of the importation of copper. They were in a lockout, as a matter of fact, more than a strike after the strike got going, because imported copper was satisfying the demands of industry.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support for the food-stamp bill as amended by Congresswoman SULLIVAN which provides for a 4-year authorization without monetary limitations on appropriations. Her amendment provides for annual congressional reviews prior to each annual appropriation, to assist and guide Congress in its funding decisions.

Congresswoman SULLIVAN's amended food-stamp bill is good because it allows for the adequate time which governing bodies need to smoothly execute the program. The food-stamp program—or any program—cannot operate efficiently if it is constantly being threatened by change. The threat of change is especially harmful to long-range planning.

Mrs. SULLIVAN's amended bill is also good because of the provision for unrestricted funding. How can a program work well if its funds are exhausted? Sufficient funds are vital to a program which involves such as essential commodity as food.

Today, over 1,000 food-stamp projects are operating in 43 States and the District of Columbia. These projects are reaching about 2.5 million persons. These

are impressive numbers. They speak for the validity of this program.

Many areas have been designated for the program and their opening dates are pending. Still more areas have requested that they be included in the program and are anxiously waiting to be designated.

The food-stamp program is a young, vital and growing program. It has been proved, through 7 years, to be a good program. The food-stamp program has been operating in Minnesota since the early days of the program. I am proud that three of the areas chosen to participate in the pilot testing of the program were from my congressional District. As proof of its success in Minnesota, the State welfare agency requested further expansion. As of April, 40 counties were in the program.

According to the April statistics from the Department of Agriculture, over 55,000 persons are receiving the benefits of the food-stamp program in Minnesota. Altogether, these participants receive over \$353,000 worth of additional food purchasing power each month. Almost one-third more than they had been spending for food before food stamps.

An article which appeared in a Minnesota newspaper had this to say about the food-stamp program:

The Food Stamp Program helps farmers by putting food where it belongs, in people's stomachs.

It helps the country by nourishing today boys and girls who'll learn better and faster if they didn't go to school hungry.

A participant wrote a letter lauding the program which reads in part:

This letter is written to tell you how happy we are because of the Food Stamp Program.

Mealtime is a pleasure now . . . The children are gaining in health and stature. I feel better because of more nourishment and because the tension of providing meals for the family on an inadequate budget has been lifted since the Food Stamp Program started.

I want to thank you for taking the time and effort to relieve this serious problem of the less fortunate citizens.

A retailer in Minnesota expressed a feeling of pride because of his authorization to accept food coupons. He said:

It's great to be able to help low-income families have a better diet.

The compliments and words of praise do not stop here. But they are indicative of the formidable acceptance the food-stamp program has enjoyed in Minnesota.

We, as a high governing body, have the power to help low-income families raise their nutritional levels. We also have the power to help the administering officials execute the program in an orderly fashion.

The tool which gives us the power to carry these things is Congresswoman SULLIVAN's bill.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge the Members of the House to support the amendment to the food stamp bill introduced by Congresswoman SULLIVAN. An amendment which provides for a 4-year authorization with no specific monetary limitation on appropriations.

Food stamps provide the low-income family with the means for a wider, more varied diet—a way to adjust food purchases to the varying needs of the family. It incorporates the desirable self-help principle. It utilizes—rather than competes with—the best food distribution system in the world, our commercial marketing complex.

The food-stamp approach has strong support and appeal among the State and local officials to whom USDA looks to get the food assistance job done. The appeal and support of the program can be a real strength as the Department of Agriculture moves to make the food-stamp program available to all those in need.

The events of the past year have placed new demands upon the food-stamp program—demands that must be taken into account now that future program funding is being discussed and planned.

We cannot develop, fund, or place the food-stamp program into nationwide operation this fiscal year. It is not possible to precisely forecast the maximum possible pace at which the program can expand. Nor can its ultimate cost be predicted. However, we must take the necessary steps to progressively move toward that goal.

The need to eliminate hunger is clear and consistent with the national interest and our standard of value. This certainly should outweigh the uncertainty over the pace at which the food-stamp program can move forward, both from a practical and financial standpoint. No artificial barriers should prevent progress toward that goal. Rather, the urgency of the need dictates development, now, of the best legislative basis under which this country can move toward the kind of stamp program that will meet national need.

The amendment to the food stamp bill requires specific rules for an indepth congressional review prior to each annual appropriation. Therefore, this amendment will assist and guide the Congress in its annual funding decision. The amended bill provides for effective congressional direction, leadership, and program review. It will permit the Congress to make its decision each year in the light of the then-current situation. A 4-year authorization will also remove the uncertainties which the States now face about the future of the program, and will implement the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to announce my support of both the food-stamp program and of the Sullivan bill to provide a 4-year appropriation authorization.

I have closely followed, over the past few years, the efforts of the Department of Agriculture to provide food assistance to needy families under both the commodity distribution and food-stamp programs.

I was especially pleased to learn that one or the other of these programs will be operating in every one of the 1,000 lowest per capita income counties by the end of August. In total, by the end of August, some 2,500 counties and inde-

pendent cities will have a family food program.

Such a food program should be in every county in the country. With our food abundances, we can settle for nothing less. That is why it is important to put the food-stamp program on a sound legislative basis. If we expect States and localities to respond to the food needs of the poor, we must give them a sound base upon which to formulate their future plans—not year-to-year uncertainty.

If we want these food assistant programs to reach all of those in need of more food, to be effectively and prudently operated—again, the legislative base has to be a sound one.

We all have a stake in these food programs—the city dweller, the suburbanite, the rural nonfarm family, and our farmers. The underconsumption of food by the poor means underdeveloped markets for our farmers.

Better diets for poor families mean more markets for livestock products and feed grains, for fruits and vegetables in all forms, for the whole range of foods produced in this country. And, markets are the base of a viable agricultural economy.

Under the food-stamp program, the extra food for poor families moves through our efficient commercial marketing system. The free stamps mean new dollars in the community, acting as a general stimulus to the local economy.

I appeared before the House Agriculture Committee in support of a general expansion in food stamp authorities. I felt, despite a number of real operating problems, there could be circumstances under which it might be feasible to offer both the commodities and food stamps. I do feel that the approach of the Sullivan bill will not only extend the program but make possible additional program flexibilities and improvements.

The modifications made last July by Secretary Freeman increased food stamp participation by over 20 percent in the areas then in operation. I think this is a clear indication that the food-stamp program has come through its beginning years in good steady condition—with potential for further contribution to both the poor and to agriculture. Additional experience, I am certain, will lead to additional improvements—if the Congress paves the way.

There are scores of counties throughout this country waiting to start the food-stamp program. It is essential that we respond—if we are serious when we express our dismay that there are some hungry or severely malnourished people in this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the necessity that we support the amendment to the food-stamp bill introduced by Congresswoman SULLIVAN. This amendment provides for a 4-year authorization with no specific monetary limitations on appropriations. However, to guide and assist the Congress in making its annual funding decisions, the amendment requires specific rules for an indepth congressional review prior to each annual ap-

appropriation. It provides for effective congressional direction, leadership and program review. And it will permit the Congress to make its decision each year in the light of the then-current situation.

The administrative record of the program is excellent, as has been attested to by Members of this House and the committee. This excellent record has not been attained by slipshod methods, but through intensive and thorough preparation prior to beginning the actual selling of the food coupons.

Such thorough preparation is time consuming, and involves administrative expenses to the States and counties. A bill to provide a 4-year authorization of the program will justify these expenditures. Can the same be said if the program is limited?

The need to eliminate hunger is clear and consistent with the national interest and our standard of values. This certainly should outweigh the uncertainty over the pace at which the food-stamp program can move forward both from a practical and financial standpoint. No artificial barriers should prevent progress toward that goal. Rather, the urgency of the need dictates development, now, of the best legislative basis under which this country can move toward the kind of food-stamp program that will meet the national need.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is sound and meritorious because the food-stamp program has been and is a success. It has worked generally well. There have been instances in which participants have not lived up to the letter and spirit of the act and regulations. The Department of Agriculture and State welfare organizations have moved in swiftly in such situations and brought charges against the offenders. It could be said full well that the plan has been administered capably and efficiently.

The purpose of the program is to aid eligible people in obtaining more nourishing and better foods for their families—to make available to them vast varieties to choose from.

The food stamps are made available through State welfare agencies. The local governmental institutions play a major role in the formulation and administration of the program. For a city or county to apply for authority to establish a food-stamp program, a request is sent to the public welfare agency of the State. It then goes to the Consumer and Marketing Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for attention. This branch of the Department considers whether the area embraced in the application is in need of the program and can pay the cost of its administration. The State welfare Department itself makes selection of the people who can buy food stamps. The cost of the stamps to a family is governed by its income and size of the family. The minimum amount of cost is 50 cents per month for each person. Food stamps serve the purpose of money. A person can shop in most grocery stores to obtain his or her food requirements. These stamps cannot be used for the purchase of cigarettes or intoxicating liquors of any description. Neither can they be used for nonfood items such as tooth-

paste and soap. A community cannot have a food distribution plan and food stamps too. On entering the food-stamp program the food distribution plan must be dropped.

The commodity distribution program now offers a much larger choice of items which are available to welfare clients. Previously the selection was smaller. Principal drawbacks to the commodity system are limited selections; the foods do not always offer balanced diets, and the problem of transportation to and from the warehouse on days of distribution. It has worked hardships on people who have no means of transportation and on the ill and infirm.

The food stamp plan is brought to the communities by channeling purchases through local or neighborhood grocery merchants. It boosts business volume and aids private industry to supply the needs of the people in the particular vicinity.

The growth of the food-stamp movement has been healthy and consistent. Congress has cooperated in its expansion. Here is what has been done: We have appropriated \$160 million for this program 2 years ago. A year ago \$185 million was provided it. In the current fiscal year \$225 million has been made available. The bill we bring to you today increases the available funds by \$20 million or to a total of \$245 million. It could not be said that the agency has been mistreated. There are those who feel that a faster acceleration is the proper procedure to follow. They propose an open-end type of operation with the Appropriations Committee determining the amount of funds that should be provided.

It cannot be said with validity that representative government has been niggardly in meeting the needs of indigent people in the country. The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MAHON] placed tables and pertinent data spelling out the amounts which have been appropriated for needy people. Mr. MAHON's remarks appeared in the June 20, 1968, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages H5293 and H5294. Here are the figures: Federal aid to the poor through all Federal agencies totaled \$9½ billion in 1960; \$12½ billion in 1963; \$24.6 billion in 1968, and \$27.7 billion in fiscal 1969.

That is not just a recognition of a problem. That is concrete evidence of doing something about solving it.

Do these figures indicate dereliction of duty in caring for our unfortunate citizens? To the contrary, they have been receiving lavish treatment at the hands of a compassionate people.

There are jobs aplenty awaiting the takers. The would-be employers are begging for help. "The vineyard is ripe unto the harvest but the workers are few."

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support of an amendment introduced by the distinguished Representative from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] which provides for a 4-year authorization of the food-stamp program without specific monetary limitations on appropriations. Included in Mrs. SULLIVAN's amendment are specific rules for an indepth congressional review prior to each annual appropriation thus

affording the Congress the opportunity to make its decision each year in the light of the then-current situation.

I consider the amendment offered by the highly esteemed Congresswoman from Missouri to be both reasonable and necessary and fail to see how this body could, in good conscience, reject such a proposal in view of the clearly manifested need for such legislation.

The food-stamp program, which we consider today, is designed to meet the primary need of the poor. It is designed to supplement the diets of low-income families.

For the approximately 19,000 people who participated in the food-stamp program in the State of Rhode Island during the month of April, food stamps meant improved diets and a chance to share in America's abundance of food. In the month of April, food stamp participants in Rhode Island were provided with about \$124,000 in bonus stamps. For these low-income families, it has meant more milk, more meat, more poultry, and more fruits and vegetables. These are the foods that make for better diets and improved health.

The food stamp program is supported in Rhode Island because it has proved its worth, and I believe it has proven its worth across our Nation. However, it has not realized the fulfillment of its potentiality in meeting the basic needs of our poor because it has not received the support it needs in terms of adequate authorization from the Congress.

I do not look upon a mere extension of this program for 1 year, as recommended by the House Agriculture Committee, to be either adequate or wise. I opposed a 1-year authorization when we considered this matter last June and I rise in opposition to a mere 1-year authorization again this time around.

What is needed is a firm commitment by the Federal Government to provide assistance to States in building a strong food-stamp program to meet the needs of the Nation's poor. I do not look upon a mere 1-year authorization as being a firm commitment. We must assure the States that adequate funds will be made available in the future to support their efforts to provide the poor with food. We should authorize adequate appropriations for a long enough period so that the States may plan and implement their programs in accordance with the overall needs across the Nation. Sufficient support must be given to generate a program that will embrace all the needy people of our land. We must not settle for anything less.

While I have in the past favored a commitment for a period of 10 years, I feel that in view of the demands for economy in Federal spending, a commitment for a period of 4 years would constitute a firm commitment and, in accordance with Mrs. SULLIVAN's legislation, would afford ample latitude for the Congress to make necessary adjustments in expenditures for this program during that period.

Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, the food stamp program is currently helping some 2½ million persons to help themselves. This is a sizable number of people. They reside in more than 1,000 areas in 43 States and the District of Columbia. They are eating better because of food stamps. They also like the program because they can shop almost anywhere they want and buy almost any kind of food. They like the dignity that this program affords them.

In addition to these people, there are many others who have been promised the program. They are waiting for the program to open in their areas. The governing officials of still others areas have submitted their requests for the program to the Department of Agriculture.

Congresswoman SULLIVAN's proposed bill is good because it allows for the adequate time which governing bodies need to smoothly execute a program. This program—or any program—cannot operate efficiently if it is constantly being threatened by change. The threat of change is especially harmful to long-range planning.

The Congresswoman's proposed bill is also good because of this provision for unrestricted funding. How can a program work well if its funds are exhausted? Sufficient funds are so vital to a program which involves such an essential commodity as food.

We, as a high-governing body, have the power to help low-income families raise their nutritional levels. We also have the power to help the administering officials execute the program in an orderly fashion.

The tool which gives us the power to carry out these things is H.R. 18249. Let us pass it.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, our responsibility to insure a wholesome supply of food to those who can afford to purchase it is not greater than our responsibility to see that food is available to all who need it.

The problems of hunger—at times, for some poor families—and of malnutrition—for larger numbers of poor families and for longer periods of time—are a present-day fact.

The national need to make a full commitment to eliminate hunger dictates the need for the Congress to authorize a 4-year extension of the food stamp program.

I think it is well that we remind ourselves that the action taken on the bill can have a very personal effect on the day-to-day lives of individual people and families.

Food stamps provide the most practical and efficient way to meet the food problems of poor families. Stamps provide the low-income family with the means for a wide, more varied diet.

The food stamp program is making striking progress and is stepping up its efforts to reach eligible people who are hungry. During the past year major changes were made in the food stamp program. And, it has become clear that the events of the past year have placed new demands upon the food stamp program.

More poor people are coming in to be certified in counties that have the food stamp program, as program provisions are being refined.

More counties want the program and they should have it.

And, more assistance should be provided to those already being reached.

I strongly support a 4-year authorization without specific monetary limitations on appropriations which would require specific rules for an in-depth congressional review prior to each annual appropriation. This will permit the Congress to make its funding decision each year in the light of the then-current situation. In addition, a 4-year authorization will remove the uncertainties which the States now face about the future of the food stamp program, and will implement the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion.

The national need to make a full commitment to eliminate hunger dictates the need for such action.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty support of an increase in the 1969 authorization for the food stamp program with the Sullivan substitute amendment which provides for an open-ended, 4-year authorization.

This legislation has been of great help to the urban communities and provides valuable food supplement to families which would otherwise subsist on inadequate diets.

This has been a meaningful program and I certainly support its extension.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] such time as he may consume.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of the original food stamp legislation, I will support the substitute amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. This amendment is identical to my bill.

Such action is necessary primarily for two reasons. First, the appropriations authorization in the committee bill of \$245 million for fiscal year 1969 is wholly inadequate. I feel that frugality should be exercised by Congress in light of the prevailing economic situation; however, providing sufficient nutritional requirements for citizens of our country is clearly of such importance that substantial additional funding for this program is necessary.

We must make every effort to abolish the existence of malnutrition in our country. The additional money authorized would be utilized to provide funds for the numerous areas of the country which have already requested the food stamp program, but which cannot get funding because sufficient money is not available. It is grossly inequitable that some counties have the program and others do not. All who desire to participate should be able to do so. Failure to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri will hurt present programs, such as the one in operation in Cleveland, since more areas will be allowed to participate and the money will be spread thinner. It is estimated that without the amendment, the Gov-

ernment may have to reduce its contribution to about \$5 a person.

Second, the amendment will provide for open-end authorization for the 3 succeeding years as well as this year. The importance of the program as indicated by its overwhelming success—3 million participants with over 1 million more, if additional money is made available, makes such action necessary to give the food stamp program greater stability.

I urge each of you to support this amendment.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 18249

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by deleting the phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;".

SEC. 2. Section 5(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is engaged in a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to the existence of a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as a result of engaging in such strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is a student attending an institution of higher learning shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided further*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to being enrolled as a student at an institution of higher learning, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as the result of being a student attending an institution of higher learning."

Mr. POAGE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SULLIVAN

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the phrase 'not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and inserting in

lieu thereof the following: 'such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972;' and (B) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: 'On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year.'"

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18249) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 18249 and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT OF BRIG. GEN. ROBERT F. McDERMOTT, DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF USAF ACADEMY

(Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, this morning, July 29, 1968, Brig. Gen. Robert F. McDermott, USAF, the dean of the faculty of the U.S. Air Force Academy was honored at a retirement ceremony and review. General McDermott will retire after more than 29 years of honorable and distinguished service.

A native of Boston, Mass., he entered the U.S. Military Academy in 1939 and graduated as a second lieutenant, Air Corps, U.S. Army in January 1943. He completed pilot training the same year and during World War II served as a fighter-bomber pilot including service as group operations officer, 474th Fighter Bomber Group, European Theater of Operations. Subsequently, he served as personnel staff officer, Headquarters USAF.

Following World War II he was project officer for schools, Headquarters USAF and in 1948 entered graduate school at the Harvard School of Business Administration.

From 1950 to 1954 he was stationed at the U.S. Military Academy serving as assistant professor of economics, department of social sciences. Some of the courses which he taught included national security and international relations.

As an outstanding officer of the line and with a special aptitude for administration, curriculum and instruction, he was one of the first Air Force officers considered and selected for the initial faculty and staff of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

He has been at and a part of the Academy ever since there has been a U.S. Air Force Academy. He was there when the Academy was in temporary facilities at Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., and moved with, in fact helped move, it to the permanent site near Colorado Springs.

When the Air Force Academy was established in 1954, he was designated professor of economics and vice dean, U.S. Air Force Academy. In 1957 he was appointed as the first permanent professor and in 1959 was appointed by President Eisenhower as the first permanent dean of the faculty and promoted brigadier general, USAF.

His military decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal with five Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Army Commendation Medal.

In addition to the B.S. degree which he received on graduation from the Military Academy he has subsequently been awarded the degrees of master of business administration, doctor of laws, and doctor of letters.

He was awarded the Air Force Association Hoyt S. Vandenberg Trophy for "outstanding contribution to aerospace progress in the field of education."

He is the author of numerous treatises, articles, and other documents related to his academic specialties and administration.

He is a highly motivated and completely dedicated individual. He is motivated by his adherence to the highest traditions of the U.S. Air Force and dedicated to its service as well as to the Academy which he has served faithfully and well.

As dean of the faculty of the Academy, he has instituted programs which have included, but have not been limited to, the academic enrichment program, the graduate study program, the development of major courses, and the introduction of new subjects to the curriculum of the Academy.

Under his academic leadership and with the support of every Superintendent of the Academy, the scholastic standards of the U.S. Air Force, in less than 14 years, has taken a rank along with the leading institutions of higher learning when measured by any criteria and yardstick.

He has been honored by his associates and by the cadet corps of the U.S. Military Academy and the cadet wing of the U.S. Air Force Academy. He is respected and recognized by the higher education community as an articulate and effective dean and director of curriculum.

I am grateful to him for his contributions to the development of the Air Force Academy, and I congratulate him on his achievements. I wish him every happiness and success as he leaves active military service.

During my association with the Academy as a member of the Board of Visitors, I have had an opportunity to know General and Mrs. McDermott and their children in a personal as well as an official way. In expressing our appreciation and extending our congratulations to General McDermott, we also express and

extend them to Alice and to their children. Each of them has contributed much to the environment and the community of the Air Force Academy.

The Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has each succinctly and clearly stated his commendations to General McDermott, and with the permission of each I include the full text of letters from Secretary Harold Brown and Gen. John P. McConnell:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,

Washington, July 9, 1968.

Brig. Gen. ROBERT F. McDERMOTT,
Dean of the Faculty, U.S. Air Force Academy,
Colo.

DEAR GENERAL MCD: As you approach your retirement from military service, I want you to know how much I appreciate the very important contribution you have made to the United States Air Force through your years of devoted service.

As their retirement draws near, few professional military men are privileged to look back as you can and behold the fine results of their efforts. As Dean at the Academy, you have been personally responsible for the academic system which not only has earned the praise of educators nationwide, but has also proved by its product the soundness of past decisions, decisions for which you were personally responsible. You can view the results of your dedication with pride.

During this final month before your retirement, I want to wish you continued good fortune and happiness as you start your second career. I am sure that success will prevail.

Sincerely,

HAROLD BROWN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE,

Washington, D.C. July 15, 1968.

Brig. Gen. ROBERT F. McDERMOTT,
Dean of the Faculty, USAFA,
USAF Academy, Colo.

DEAR BOB: On your departure from active duty I want to join your many friends and associates in expressing our gratitude for your outstanding performance of duty.

I am sure these years of distinguished service to your country will always be a source of great personal satisfaction. As Dean of the Faculty, United States Air Force Academy, you have demonstrated unique qualities as an intellectual leader and military educator. The enviable reputation of the Academy as an educational institution and the high morale of the faculty in large measure can be attributed to your superior direction as an administrator.

Upon retirement you may reflect with pride upon many difficult jobs well done. I am confident that retirement will not diminish your interest in the Air Force.

The Air Staff joins me in extending best wishes for many years of further success and happiness.

Sincerely,

J. P. McCONNELL,
General, USAF, Chief of Staff.

General McDermott's ability and effective performance have been recognized in the Air Force, the Department of Defense and by the higher education community at large.

His experience as an educator began in 1950 when he was assigned as an instructor in the department of social sciences at West Point under the tutelage of two distinguished educators, Col. Herman Beukema and Col. George A. Lincoln. While serving as assistant professor and director of the courses in economics and personal finance and insurance he wrote two books: "Principles

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 31, 1968
For actions of July 30, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 134

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....13	Farm program.....2,27	Opinion poll.....30
Aging.....5	Federal aid.....35	Personnel.....15
Appropriations.....3,14	Fish inspection.....24	Poultry inspection....4,24
CCC.....14	Food stamps.....1	Report.....30
Census.....37	Foreign aid.....20	Reclamation.....36
Coffee.....26	Foreign trade.....10,33	Research.....12
Commissions.....29	Grain inspection.....18	School lunch.....17
Conservation.....8,23	Grapes.....32	Taxation.....11
Dairy imports.....28	Hunger.....16	Timber exports.....34
Economy.....31	Lands.....23,34	Transportation.....7
Education.....19	Legislative record.....9	Veterans' benefits.....6
Farm labor.....25	Metric system.....21	Wildlife.....22

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed food stamp bill. House debated farm bill. Senate adopted measure to establish hunger commission. Senate agreed to conference report on grain inspection bill. Senate continued debate on foreign aid authorization bill.

HOUSE

1. FOOD STAMPS. Passed with amendment S. 3068, the food stamp bill (pp. H7796-818). Agreed to, 227-172, an amendment by Rep. Sullivan to provide an open-end authorization for the fiscal years 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972 (pp. H7796-812) amended to "prohibit the use of food stamps for students and strikers" (p. H7811). Rejected a motion by Rep. Belcher to recommit the bill (p. H7817). H. R. 18249, a similar bill was tabled.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE SAM FRIEDEL

(Mr. BURLERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURLERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I resign the chairmanship of the Committee on House Administration, and my position as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I value highly the friendships and the associations I have had on these committees. I feel, however, the challenge before me as I become a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

As I leave the chairmanship of the House Administration Committee, I do so with a certain consolation and confidence, that the leadership of the committee will be left in good hands as the competent, affable, and able gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] assumes the chair.

I have never had a more pleasant and rewarding experience than having had our colleague, SAM FRIEDEL, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts for a long period of time. He is one of the most diligent and dedicated public servant I have known. His energy and close attention to duty often amazes me. It is safe to say that he handles a volume of details greater than any other one single Member of this House and this is in addition to his highly important position on the Interstate and Foreign Committee.

I extend to the friend of all of us, the Honorable SAM FRIEDEL, my warmest congratulations and best wishes for his continued success. As one so highly esteemed by his associates here in the Congress, I know he will have an appreciative response in these new responsibilities and I am sure I speak for many, if not every Members of this House, in pledging our fullest support and cooperation to him.

I am most grateful for the support given me here today in realizing an ambition for your trust and confidence in electing me to this most important committee and his highly responsible position.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF JUNE 19, 1968 (PUBLIC LAW 351, 90TH CONGRESS)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3679) to amend the act of June 19, 1968 (Public Law 351, 90th Congress) and ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman tell us briefly what this is about?

Mr. CELLER. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa, let me first say that this request was conveyed to the ranking member on the Republican side of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], and that gentleman acquiesced. I am asking unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of S. 3679, which makes clerical and nonsubstantive changes in the omnibus crime bill. When the bill was passed in the Senate and we accepted it, as the gentleman may remember, without debate in the House, there were discovered subsequent to the passage by the House and the Senate certain improper references made to certain sections which we are now correcting. These changes are nonsubstantive and technical.

Mr. GROSS. These are technical changes in the bill?

Mr. CELLER. These are technical changes in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Not substantive changes?

Mr. CELLER. They are not substantive changes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has personally reported to the minority the nature of the changes. The changes are purely technical changes, and we have no objection to them on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3679

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clauses (1), (2), and (3) of section 520(b) of the Act of June 19, 1968 (Public Law 351, Ninetieth Congress), are amended by striking out "302" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "301".

SEC. 2. The caption of title II of the Act of June 19, 1968 (Public Law 351, Ninetieth Congress), immediately preceding section 701 thereof is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—ADMISSIBILITY OF CONFESSIONS AND ADMISSIBILITY OF EYE-WITNESS TESTIMONY".

SEC. 3. Section 1401(a) of the Act of June 19, 1968 (Public Law 351, Ninetieth Congress), is amended by striking out "Chapter 204" and inserting in lieu thereof "Chapter 205".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, AUGUST 2, TO WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 805, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 805

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Friday, August 2, 1968, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, September 4, 1968.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE AND PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 806 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 806

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding any adjournment of the two Houses until September 4, 1968, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until September 4, 1968, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF S. 2269 AND H.R. 18763, UNDER UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that I have been advised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that on tomorrow S. 2269, to amend the act of August 27, 1954, relative to the unlawful seizure of fishing vessels of the United States by foreign countries, will be called up under a unanimous-consent request.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] that on tomorrow the bill H.R. 18763, to authorize preschool and early education programs for handicapped children, will be called up under a unanimous-consent request.

EVENTS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the past 6 months, events have been moving rapidly in Czechoslovakia.

Under a new Communist leadership, headed by Alexander Dubcek, Czechoslo-

vakia has initiated a series of bold experiments designed, in the words of one reporter, to temper the traditional Marxist doctrine with democracy.

Thoughtful people throughout the world have been watching these developments with care, realizing their potential significance not only for Czechoslovakia but for all of Europe as well.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has conducted various hearings and issued a number of reports on developments in Eastern and Central Europe, I have had special, deep interest in that area of the world.

That interest, of course, is that of a bystander or an observer because neither the Congress nor the executive branch of our Government have anything to do with what is going on in Prague.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk stressed recently that the United States has no intention of getting involved in Czechoslovakia's internal affairs.

Nevertheless, we cannot help but be aware of what is transpiring in Czechoslovakia and around its borders.

Some of those developments are not very reassuring and give us cause for concern.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD some further observations and extraneous materials relating to developments in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from New York on her statement. To me, the silence on the part of our Government in the face of developments in Czechoslovakia is disgraceful.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois but I want to repeat that the policy of our Government is one of not interfering with the developments in Czechoslovakia.

(Mr. DICKINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

[Mr. DICKINSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EXCESS OF VOTES ON GUN BILL

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, last week we discussed the gun control legislation. I was aware that, notwithstanding my strong opposition to the passage of the legislation, there was a strong desire in this body to enact some kind of gun law. But I did not realize how strong the support for the bill was. I note on pages H7386 and H7387 of the RECORD there were 350 "ayes," 118 "nays," and nine not voting, which gives us a total of 477 votes. I was under the impression we had only 433 Members of the House at the present time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 292]

Anderson, Tenn.	Flood	Long, La.
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	Lukens
Baring	Fulton, Tenn.	Moore
Blackburn	Gardner	Morse, Mass.
Blanton	Goodell	Pike
Bolton	Gubser	Rarick
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Rees
Brown, Mich.	Hawkins	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burke, Fla.	Hébert	Rhodes, Pa.
Corman	Herlong	Schweiker
Cramer	Holland	Skubitz
Davis, Wis.	Irwin	Teague, Calif.
Esch	Joelson	Waggonner
Evins, Tenn.	Karsten	Watson
	Lipscomb	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16363 AMENDING POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16363) to clarify and otherwise amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State poultry products inspection programs, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PURCELL, STUBBLEFIELD, FOLEY, BELCHER, and Mrs. MAY.

TO ASSIST VETERANS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN OBTAINING SUITABLE EMPLOYMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 705), to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

On page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out "elsewhere during the Vietnam era;" and insert: "elsewhere;"

On page 2, line 13, strike out all after "such" where it appears the second time down to and including "means," in line 16 and insert: "lawful action".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. FEIGHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

INCREASE IN 1969 AUTHORIZATION FOR FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 18249) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 18249, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Committee had agreed that the bill would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, and there was pending the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SULLIVAN

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the phrase 'not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972;' and (B) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: 'On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, we are now at the moment of decision on the future of the food stamp program. The question this amendment poses is a simple one: Should the program be permitted to expand to such size as the Congress is willing to appropriate the funds to pay for this year and for 3 subsequent years or shall it be confined to the areas which now have it, plus a limited additional number of mostly small counties, and terminate a year from now unless Congress passes new legislation early next year?

By adopting my amendment, sponsored by 130 Members of the House, we would not be issuing any blank check to this or to any succeeding Secretary of Agriculture. He has a blank check now on many farm programs. But we are not giving him one on this program.

The only money which could be spent for the food stamp program under my substitute amendment is the amount clearly appropriated by the Congress for this year or any of the 3 subsequent fiscal years—not a cent more.

Mr. MAHON's Committee on Appropriations, and Mr. WHITTEN's Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, would have to review the estimates and make provision in the regular appropriation process for any funds this program would receive under my amendment.

The Committee on Appropriations has been far more enthusiastic about the food stamp program than the Committee on Agriculture, but the Committee on Appropriations, as we all know, is no Santa Claus. The fund requests would have to be justified on hard facts and clear evidence.

Such facts and such evidence, however, do not seem to impress the Committee on Agriculture. Whenever that committee has grudgingly reported a food stamp bill, it has usually been one loaded down with amendments intended to curtail or kill the program. And the only times we have ever succeeded in having that committee act at all on food stamp bills were when farm bills were pending, and were in trouble. We have had to ransom the necessary food stamp bills out of that committee and tie them into farm bills in order to have a chance to vote for the food stamp program.

That is what happened in 1958, 1959, in 1964 and 1967. It has happened again this year. The 1968 farm bill was in trouble, and so now we have a food stamp bill to vote on—a bad bill, an inadequate bill, but at least a bill we can now amend in order to expand this program. In return, those of us from urban areas who have usually voted for farm bills in the past, because we believe in the necessity of aiding the farmer to stay on his farm, could now, in good conscience, be able to vote "aye" for the farmer, knowing that the committee which handles both farm and food stamp bills has reluctantly reported out a food stamp bill which we can amend and improve.

There have been many criticisms of our programs to help feed the hungry in this country. Most of those criticisms were unfairly directed at the Secretary of Agriculture, who has done more than any man who ever held that office to assure better diets for the low-income people of our country. Secretary Freeman started the food stamp program—he and President Kennedy. He believes in it. He has tried manfully and skillfully to make it more effective.

Recently, we passed a bill to create a Commission on Hunger. We heard then many criticisms of the fact that large areas of this country did not have a food stamp program. All but eight of the 49 Democrats who sponsored the bill to create that Commission are cosponsors of my amendment today to permit a wide expansion of the food stamp program, and those eight will, I feel sure, support

our amendment; but only four of the 38 Republicans who sponsored that bill for an investigation into hunger have cosponsored this bill to expand the food stamp program. A Commission can do some good and undoubtedly can discover many facts we already know—such as that we have millions of undernourished Americans. On the other hand, my amendment here today can make possible the extension of the food stamp program to include those undernourished Americans. If all we want is a political issue, we can denounce hunger. But if we really want to do something about it, then vote for this amendment.

LIST OF SPONSORS BY STATES OF OPEN-END AUTHORIZATION

Mr. Chairman, the 130 sponsors of this legislation include the chairmen of 10 standing committees of the House, and four ranking minority members of standing committees.

The list, by States, is as follows:

Alaska: Mr. POLLOCK.

Arizona: Mr. UDALL.

California: Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SISK, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. REES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. McFALL.

Colorado: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ASPINALL.

Connecticut: Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. ST. ONGE, and Mr. IRWIN.

Florida: Mr. PEPPER.

Hawaii: Mr. MATSUNAGA and Mrs. MINK.

Illinois: Mr. DAWSON, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. RONAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. YATES, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SHIPLEY, and Mr. PRICE.

Indiana: Mr. BRADEMAS and Mr. JACOBS.

Iowa: Mr. SMITH and Mr. CULVER.

Kentucky: Mr. PERKINS.

Maine: Mr. KYROS and Mr. HATHAWAY.

Maryland: Mr. GARMATZ.

Massachusetts: Mr. BOLAND, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. O'NEILL, Mrs. HECKLER, and Mr. BURKE.

Michigan: Mr. RUPPE, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. NEDZI.

Minnesota: Mr. KARTH, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. BLATNIK.

Missouri: Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Montana: Mr. OLSEN.

New Jersey: Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. THOMPSON.

New Mexico: Mr. WALKER.

New York: Mr. WOLFF, Mr. TENZER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. CAREY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. REID, Mr. RESNICK, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. PODELL.

Ohio: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. ASHLEY.

Pennsylvania: Mr. BARRETT, Mr. NIX, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. FULTON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. HOLLAND.

Rhode Island: Mr. ST GERMAIN and Mr. TIERNAN.

South Carolina: Mr. McMILLAN.

South Dakota: Mr. REIFEL.

Tennessee: Mr. FULTON and Mr. ANDERSON.

Texas: Mr. PATMAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

Washington: Mr. ADAMS, Mrs. HANSEN, and Mr. HICKS.

West Virginia: Mr. SLACK, Mr. HECHLER, and Mr. KEE.

Wisconsin: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Missouri and to support her amendment. She has worked very hard for many years for the poor, not only for the food stamp program, but for housing and homeownership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri to provide a 4-year open-ended authorization for the food stamp program.

Mr. Chairman, there are far too many people of all ages, black and white, in this country who go to bed hungry. They simply do not have the money to buy the foods for a proper balanced, nutritional diet. Every Member of the House is aware, I am certain, of the pressing need for action to relieve this deplorable condition. The food stamp program has shown the hoped-for promise of providing food—in a balanced diet—for these poor of our own country, who for too long have suffered.

Those who object to the open-ended authorization in the amendment, I believe, are refusing to fully face the present crisis that exists. They are unwilling to face the realities that here in this affluent country of ours there are far too many who exist on starvation diets.

If we are to solve this problem quickly, we must provide the Secretary of Agriculture not only with the necessary tools but with legislation in a form which will clearly express congressional concern and intent. Concern over problem and intent to correct the condition as quickly as possible.

This, the amendment by the gentlewoman from Missouri will do. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and hope that it will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. One of the things I personally do not understand is the reason for the extension of the program for a 4-year period. I wonder if the gentlewoman would advance, for my benefit at least, the reasons for that need.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would be happy to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Missouri has expired.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. SULLIVAN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, there is ample precedent for these programs of the Department of Agriculture to be for more than 1 year. We have such a precedent in the farm program.

Mr. CAHILL. I am not interested in other programs. If the gentlewoman will yield further, I am interested in the reason why the gentlewoman believes it is necessary in this particular program.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would be happy to answer. The gentleman has been here all of these years covering the period I have just recited—1958, 1959, 1964, and 1967—and he knows we have had to fight con-

stantly with the Committee on Agriculture to get any bill at all out of that committee. When a bill does come out, it usually comes out crippled, and we have to correct it on the floor. I think we should not have to go back to that committee every single year to plead with them to let this program survive. If the committee wants to review it and wants to kill it, they can do so by positive action any year they want to. They retain jurisdiction, but they cannot kill the program merely by inaction if we pass this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Also we have counties that want to come into the program, and really, if they are going to come into the program, they must plan, hire personnel and tool up for it. They must hire employees. They need to know the program will last more than 1 year. In Iowa, 10 counties are waiting to come into the program. They have to program their tax at least 1 year ahead. They have to tool up. It seems to me, just as in the case of the farm program where farmers need to know ahead of time, local communities need to know they will have more than a 1-year program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am happy to yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that is one of the reasons the gentlewoman has in mind. The amendment would assure a continuity for 4 years, and it would avoid the uncertainty every year that we know this most deserving program encounters. Is my inference correct, that this would assure continuity?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it would. I would also like to say that the amendment I have offered today allows this program to grow, and we have been trying to encourage its growth and help people learn how this program operates. That is why, each year, more and more money is required—because the program is growing in size, not only in the number of areas in which it is in operation, but in the participation by low-income families in those areas. As other areas apply, they can be brought into it, if we have the authority to appropriate more money. But the program would still be restricted to the amounts we actually appropriate.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for just one more question?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. The thing that concerns me, and on which I would like the gentlewoman's comment, is the fact that constitutionally we are elected to serve for a period of 2 years and we are, I believe, expected by the intent of the Constitution to reflect what the people of this country think. I am wondering how we can really, in this particular Congress, justify extending a program over and beyond not only our term but even one more term. I am wondering

if the gentlewoman would not consider reducing the period from 4 years to perhaps 2 years, so that it would be at least in line with the service that we have as elected Representatives. I could support a 2-year extension, but I have trouble justifying any longer extension than a congressional term of office.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the answer to the gentleman is that we should do what we think is necessary now. If the next Congress feels something else is necessary, it should act accordingly.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. I should add that my substitute deals only with the authorization for appropriations. The 1964 Act is permanent legislation. We are not extending the Food Stamp Act today—just the authority under it to appropriate the necessary funds.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri to provide an open-ended authorization for the food stamp program.

It is shameful that so many of the people of this country suffer from malnutrition and near starvation. This condition exists in far too many areas of the country—urban and rural both. We have been made fully aware of the fact that far too many of our people, women and children, young people and old people, black and white, go to bed hungry at night.

We know that the food stamp program, where it has been operating, has done a better job at a lower cost per person than any other program to correct this deplorable condition. Those who object to open-ended authorization of this proposal would seemingly prefer to ignore the facts. Possibly in the hopes that they will disappear. We know, they will not.

The amendment before us will allow for a limited expansion of the program. It will serve to give the Secretary of Agriculture a clear indication that it is the intent, desire and will of the Congress to attack this problem of hunger in this country and that this one tool should be used where possible. And most important that this tool will be available for a number of years—not that it will have to be fought for every year.

Mr. Chairman, with all my heart I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and vote for its adoption.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute food stamp bill offered by our distinguished colleague from St. Louis, Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and the one

Member of Congress who has done more than any other individual to bring about the establishment of a food stamp program for low-income Americans.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri to permit a continuous, orderly expansion of the food stamp program into areas which do not now have the program, and to assure the continued operation after the current fiscal year of our existing food stamp projects, including the one in Cook County, Ill., which is helping more than 108,000 people to eat properly the good foods they need.

We are all deeply concerned these days about the starvation occurring in the Biafra area of Africa, but it comes as a shock to most Americans to learn that we also have widespread malnutrition here in the United States. This is not because of war, or lack of food, or lack of transportation, or lack of anything—except lack of sufficient use of the resources we already have to feed our needy.

For instance, more than half of the counties in the United States do not have the food stamp program. In those areas such as Chicago which do have it, not nearly as many people are participating in it as should be. This presents an educational problem as well as an administrative one—we must reach more of the eligible people and convince them of the advantages of buying the food stamps and obtaining in that way a much better diet than they can afford on their own. Sometimes, the food stamp purchase requirements are too high for a particular family in comparison to the family income, and this is something the Department of Agriculture must take into consideration in the administration of the program.

But we cannot expand the food stamp program into new areas or lower the participating families' share of the cost of the food stamps unless we appropriate substantially more money for the program than it is legally possible to appropriate under existing law. That is why I cosponsored the bill providing for an open-ended authorization, and that is why I rise now in support of the motion to substitute this bill for the inadequate bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture—a bill which raises the ceiling on appropriations by only \$20 million and which authorizes continuation of the program only for the current fiscal year.

If we pass the bill proposed by the Committee on Agriculture, we will not be able to expand the program to the hundreds of areas which want the food stamp program. Furthermore, by limiting the legislation just to the present fiscal year, the committee bill would create a serious problem next year, when a new Congress will be convening—and it will be many weeks before all of the committee assignments are made and legislative work can begin. In order to keep the food stamp program from ending next July 1, the new Congress would have to get it enacted into law early in the session in time to permit the appropriation of funds to keep

the program going. There is no reason to put the program in such jeopardy.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the 4-year authorization proposed in the substitute bill, in preference to the 1-year authorization contained in the committee bill. The committee bill contains an amendment to the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to prohibit food stamps being sold to strikers. I did not know that going on strike is a crime in the United States, punishable by having your children denied the benefits of a government nutrition program. Should we bar strikers' children from participating also in the school lunch program? This is ridiculous. I oppose the committee bill and support the substitute measure.

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. I rise also to congratulate her upon the leadership which she has given to the food stamp program over the years, both here in the House and across the Nation.

I also commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for bringing this matter to the floor. Indeed I commend all members of the committee with whom I served so many years. I appreciate what you have done in preparing and presenting this bill. I believe the amendment will improve it.

This amendment provides for a 4-year authorization without specific monetary limitations on appropriations. The amendment includes specific rules for congressional review prior to each annual appropriation. It will thus permit the Congress to make its decision each year in the light of the then-current situation. A 4-year authorization will also remove the uncertainties which the States now face about the future of the food stamp program, and will implement the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion.

On April 8, 1964, the House of Representatives took a forward step toward the improvement of nutrition among this Nation's poor. That day marked the passage of the Food Stamp Act. This act, most simple in concept, has since proven to be an effective instrument for getting more and better food to people who need it.

At the time of the 1964 action, the food stamp program was operating in 43 areas in 22 States under the 3-year pilot program. It has been carefully tested and developed. Today, the food stamp program is contributing materially to the well-being of approximately 2.5 million persons, by providing a more nutritious diet through added food-buying power.

It is essential that these persons be assured that the program will continue, and that the supervisors of the program are assured of its firm continuation in order to maintain the professional skills needed to insure the admirable administrative record of the program.

I urge my colleagues to accept Congresswoman SULLIVAN's amended food stamp bill so that the Department of

Agriculture and the States can move forward with this program.

Counties and cities are waiting in line to get the program. They must invest money and staff time to inaugurate the program. We have the means to assure them that the program will continue beyond next June.

States and counties that are now in the program are reluctant to spend funds and staff time to improve their operations or to reach more eligible people. They are saying: "How can you ask for such an additional investment on our part, when we have no assurance that food stamps will be continued next year?"

The food stamp program is not complicated to operate. I have heard it referred to as unbelievably simple for a Government program. Nevertheless, it takes time to set it up, to hire staff, negotiate contracts with local issuing agents, and to certify recipients. And, it takes time to educate recipients in the best way to use their food stamps.

Let us approve the substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri so that we may have a better food stamp program.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I supported this amendment when it appeared before the committee, and I support it today. I will not belabor this committee with the reasons why I support the amendment as offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] but I would like to make several comments concerning the food stamp program and the bill that will follow it, the farm bill.

During the 90th Congress, this House has debated many complex issues concerning domestic policy. It is evident from the debate and from the subsequent votes on bills designed to cure these problems that there is a deep division between Members of the House who represent rural communities and those of us who represent urban communities.

I believe this is so because many Americans living in rural communities do not fully comprehend the problems of the ghettos, the industrial slums, and the negative aspects of living in our complex cities and, by the same token, I am aware of the fact that many Americans living in our urban centers do not fully appreciate the problems experienced by agricultural America.

It is evident that what we do here on the floor of the House not only affects our immediate constituencies, but also affects Americans across the Nation. This leaves us with the issue of consensus and understanding between rural communities and urban communities.

Can there be any agreement? Is there a pivotal issue from which it can begin? I believe, gentlemen, that there is a point of beginning, because during all of the debate we have had on the floor there is one thing that is constant, and that is the theme of our building for a stronger America.

I submit that America is not stronger if in an era of unprecedented wealth there is inequality in living. America is not stronger if the cancers in our cities continue to grow. America is not stronger unless Americans are safe to walk our streets by day and by night. America is not stronger unless we are able to feed all of our citizens adequately. And, yes, America is not stronger unless we have a viable and workable farm policy and all the necessary attendant projects to make it a reality.

Last week during the course of a debate, the Speaker in the well of this House made a comment which I feel applies here as well.

He stated, "If we are to err, let us err on the side of strength."

I know there are doubts among those of us who represent rural communities and among those of us who represent urban communities concerning both programs, the food stamp program and the farm program. However, I urge my colleagues to resolve that doubt in behalf of a stronger America and vote for both of these programs; for history will not record those things which divide us but only what action we have taken after Americans both in the rural areas and in the urban areas have asked this Congress for help.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine work with the Agriculture Committee, and also the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

I wish to emphasize the pressing need for action on the food stamp bill as amended by Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN. Today, more than 1,000 projects are operating the food stamp program in 43 States and the District of Columbia. These projects are reaching approximately 2.5 million persons. These are impressive numbers. They alone speak for the validity of this program and suggest the urgency for prompt passage of final legislation.

In addition, many more projects, already designated for the program, are awaiting the go-ahead to open their projects. Further, a number of areas around the country have requested that they be included in the program. To defer action on this bill is to deny these areas their needed food assistance and to ignore the effectiveness of this program.

Congresswoman SULLIVAN has proposed that the program be extended for 4 more years and without monetary restrictions. As a cosponsor, I feel this is how the bill should be enacted. Also proposed in the amended bill is an in-depth congressional review prior to each annual appropriation.

There are distinct reasons why the bill should not be limited to specific monetary restrictions or to a short-term extension. In one word—impracticality.

On the various governmental levels, administrators cannot effectively and smoothly execute a program when time or money are of an overbearing essence.

Or, when they are under the constant threat of change.

The uncertainties which would accompany such a short-term, limited bill would hinder the very purpose of the program—the benefits achieved in food assistance to the poor.

The food stamp program is a successful program. Despite its obvious criticisms—which all programs have—it is a popular program. It has done well. But it should and can do better. It can do better if it is extended for 4 more years—and if it has no monetary restrictions.

(Mr. TIERNAN and Mr. BRASCO asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, there have been expressions by various Members already on the amendment. I wonder if we could not limit debate to about 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I object. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he would request unanimous consent for a longer period than 15 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. How much time?

Mr. BELCHER. About 30 minutes?

Mr. POAGE. That is all right with me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right object, I will not object only if I am guaranteed my 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I object. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, this food-stamp plan spent \$185 million last year. Automatically it will go up to \$225 million for the coming year. The committee bill provides for an extra \$20 million, which means \$245 million as compared with \$185 million for last year.

I voted for the tax bill. I also voted for a \$6 billion cut in expenditures.

I did not want to vote for a tax bill any more than any other Member of the House wants to vote for increased taxes. It is easy to vote for appropriations, but it is pretty hard to vote for taxes. Nevertheless, I did vote for it, for the very reason my good friend who just preceded me in the well of the House stated: I wanted America strong. I thought America was facing a very desperate situation. And I was so advised by the administration, and I took the advice of the administration, and I went along with the President on a 10-percent tax bill.

We had a bill here just yesterday to exempt the Post Office Department from

the cut they are going to take. It was suggested at that time we were going to have another bill which would exempt some other department, which was to have been a part of the \$6 billion.

If at the very same time the administration tells me we face a desperate fiscal situation in this country we are going to expand programs, then I believe I was misled in the first place and I should not have voted for the tax bill.

This program is not asked to cut back. It is not even asked to spend the same money it spent last year. The committee itself gave them \$60 million, which was a 33⅓-percent raise over the money that was spent last year, at the very same time we are going to have to cut a lot of other programs which are in many instances just as important, and which are designed for the purpose of taking care of poor people just like this one is.

One of the differences I have with the gentlewoman from Missouri on this particular program is the fact that this is to take care of those people who have money, not the people who do not have money—the people who have to have groceries and so forth. This is to supplement the diet of people who already have money to buy groceries with and who would spend their money to go with a portion of the food stamp funds to get a better diet. First of all I think it is important to feed the people who do not have any food rather than to make a better diet for people who already have food. For that reason I do not think we should increase this program more than \$60 million, because there are lots of other welfare programs that are being cut back.

I am just wondering if that side of the aisle would be as enthusiastic about expanding every single program at the very same time that the President of the United States has promised us he would cut back \$6 billion. I think the committee bill should be sustained.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], in speaking of the savings from the taxpayers' money—I would like to ask him if he is aware that there a quarter of a million Oklahomans getting free surplus food from the Federal Government at a cost of \$11 per month for each one of those persons. This is the cost to the Federal Government for this free food. Because of the lack of variety in the surplus food, this constitutes a completely inadequate diet. Would they not be better off with food stamps, at an average cost to the Government of \$6.73 a month for a better diet, instead of the \$11 a month it costs the Government now to give them surplus foods?

Mr. BELCHER. I would say to the gentlewoman that she should ask the majority leader, who comes from that part of Oklahoma which contains most of the citizens getting the free commodities. It

does not happen to be in my section of the State. Therefore, the majority leader would be much better qualified to say whether they should keep the present program or take the food stamp program. I never heard him advocate bringing the food stamp program into Oklahoma. Maybe he has and I have not heard it; but, at any rate, he is the man you should ask that question of, because he just spoke for this part of the bill and should be the one to question on this matter.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, I think, misconstrues the facts. There are quite a few counties, not in my congressional district, in which food distribution is made. As a matter of fact, some of the richest counties in Oklahoma are in my congressional district. I would also say to my friend from Oklahoma that I have had county commissioners tell me they wanted to change to this program. As far as I am concerned, I would say the programs should be optional. I think this is a good program for those who want it, and that is all I am advocating at this time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. This has been a very illuminating discussion. What difference does it make whether the people who are hungry are in your district or not? I am voting here as a national legislator. If somebody is hungry in the eastern part or the northern end of Oklahoma and this program will bring help to them, I am going to vote for it. I do not care whose district it is in.

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 17721, which would provide for a 4-year extension of the food stamp program, without monetary limitation on appropriations, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

There is little or no question about the need for a food stamp program. The issues presented concern themselves with the term of extension—whether it should be 1 year or 4 years—and with the amount of authorization. Undeniably, a 4-year extension would erase the uncertainties of a short-term bill. With a longer term extension, the administering officials at all levels—Federal, State, and local—would be able to make better plans for the execution of a program of proven worth. In addition, a 4-year authorization would provide the low-income families the security of knowing that their food assistance will continue for at least that period of time.

Monetary limitations on this type of bill would place the same kind of damper on the program as a short-term extension. Foremost are the uncertainties they would create about a program which is designed to meet a rapidly expanding need. A program of this nature should be made available to all of our Nation's

hungry and ill fed, and not be limited to just a few.

At present, this commendable program is operating in over 1,000 areas in 43 States, including my own State of Hawaii and the District of Columbia. Approximately 2.5 million persons are beneficiaries of this self-help program. Many of these people are literally being given the bread of life through this program. Children are being spared the crippling effects of malnutrition. There are, however, many more desperately in need of this program but waiting for the necessary funds. Adoption of the Sullivan substitute amendment would insure the furtherance of the food stamp program in those needy areas.

Mr. Chairman, the food stamp program in the Aloha State has been one of outstanding success from its very inception. The program was inaugurated in Hawaii in the city and county of Honolulu on April 12, 1966. Some 3,057 welfare families were initially certified as being eligible to participate in the program, and within 30 days approximately 300 low-income families had applied. The program was eventually expanded to include the three remaining counties in Hawaii. Preliminary figures compiled by the Department of Agriculture show that, for June 1968, 11,385 persons in the State of Hawaii were participating in the program and the estimated total value of the bonus coupons issued that month was \$70,000. Bonus coupons of the estimated total value of \$685,000 have been distributed in Hawaii during fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the figures for my State are representative of the other counties in other States where the food stamp program is in operation. Its almost instant success goes to prove that this program is not only an effective instrument in the war on poverty, but it is also an expression of the beneficent spirit of America. In this, our land of plenty, there is no reason why our Nation's food abundance should not be utilized to the maximum extent practicable to safeguard the health and well-being of our Nation's needy, who today face the scourge of malnutrition.

The elimination of the dollar limitation as proposed in the substitute bill, H.R. 17721, would make possible the implementation of the food stamp program at a level which would eliminate a certain amount of selectivity among geographic areas and the people within a geographic area who are in need of its assistance, and bring its benefits to all who are the intended beneficiaries of the program. I am fully cognizant of the objections which are voiced against an "open-ended" authorization, but I am also confident that the very nature of the food stamp program, wherein the beneficiaries themselves must provide the basic funds for the purchase of food stamps, will prevent abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge a favorable vote for the substitute amendment. By its adoption we will be waging a real battle in the war on poverty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

(On request of Mr. EDMONDSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MATSUNAGA

was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, since the question of the requirement for these food programs in Oklahoma has been raised and debated a little bit, I believe it in order that the record should be set straight. The current figures from the Department indicate that practically every county in the State of Oklahoma is benefiting from surplus food distribution. As a matter of fact, in Tulsa County, which is the second largest county in the State, 13,529 people—the second highest number of people in any county of our State—are benefiting from commodity distributions. The number in Oklahoma County, our largest county, exceeds 26,000. Surplus food distribution is a program that is benefiting people all over the State of Oklahoma, just as it is benefiting people in all of the States of the Union.

I agree wholeheartedly with the majority leader in his position that it is a healthy thing and a desirable thing to have local options available to the people as to the programs to be used to assist low-income families in their localities.

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, again I wonder if we could not limit this debate and move along, since we have another bill to come up this afternoon, we hope.

Therefore I would ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end at 10 minutes of 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. POAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 10 minutes after 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TEAGUE of California) there were—ayes 65, noes 53. So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlelady from Missouri for her substitute offer here today. As many of

you know, I had joined together with her and 128 of our colleagues in introducing H.R. 17721 earlier this year. That bill is identical to her substitute amendment which is being offered here today.

I thoroughly support this 4-year program for the reason that our local governments need an opportunity to plan for such a program as this. Such planning includes the hiring of people to administer this program locally. These employees have to learn how the program operates and they can only learn from experience. I submit that it would be extremely difficult if not impossible to get qualified people to work for just 1 year if they are unsure they will have continued employment.

But more than this, I would like to see a permanent program of this sort—a continuing program. I think it is sufficient that the Appropriations Committee review the food stamp program every year without having an annual battle for authorization. This is the viewpoint that is shared by the 130 Members of the House who cosponsored this bill and its identical companion measures. We all believe the food stamp program is the finest plan ever devised to enable all of our citizens, regardless how poor or how small their income, to have a balanced diet in a nation with an abundant food production. I should also point out that this view is shared by the four members of the Agriculture Committee who voted for this legislation in the committee.

It is important to point out that the cost of the food stamp program is only about half the cost of free handouts of such agricultural surpluses as powdered eggs, peanut butter, dried milk, and corn meal. The average Federal subsidy within the food stamp program to some 2.5 million persons is \$6.73 per month. This subsidy does more than any program yet devised to insure a nutritious diet for participating families. On the other hand, it costs the Federal Government \$11 a month to give away the surplus commodities I have mentioned to more than 3 million persons. In other words, the Government is paying almost twice as much per person to supplement diets in a less than satisfactory fashion.

The food stamp program that we are joining in support of today is also beneficial to our farmers because more farm products will be purchased in the marketplace.

I anticipate there will be an attempt to attach an amendment which would exclude from this program the breadwinners who are involved in a strike or work stoppage. Mr. Chairman, I have lived in areas where we have had strikes. The citizens of my State, Montana, have just suffered through an 8-month copper strike. The children of the families involved in the strike did not vote for the strike. Neither did all the male heads of households, heads of families, vote for the strike. But they were all out of work, they were all outside the farms when the mines and mills were shut down, and they all desperately needed food stamp help. Thank God they had it.

I do not know what would have happened to them otherwise because that strike lasted for 8 months and it was not the strike alone that kept them out of

work. They were outside the farms because of the cost of copper and because of the imports of copper. They were in a walkout, as a matter of fact, more than a strike after the strike got underway because import copper was satisfying the demands of industry. The fact of the matter is that some of the companies against whom the strike was declared were the ones most responsible for the sharp increase in copper imports. Before the strike began they sold copper at 38 cents a pound on the open competitive market. During the strike as imports rose the price of copper also rose to 65 cents and, as a matter of fact, as high as 80 cents at times. Last April imports were up a whopping 115 percent from the April 1967 level and for the first 4 months of this year ran 44 cents more—above the 38 cents or 82 cents—than during the same period in 1967. The April 1967 level could be called a normal import volume. Thus you can see the imports were a tremendous benefit to the integrated copper companies and contributed to a continuation of the strike.

I do not think it can be said that the food stamp program contributed to a continuation of the strike. It simply prevented starvation of many families during the strike.

These are the reasons that I rise today in support of the Sullivan substitute which is before the House today. I urge all of you, my colleagues in the House, to lend your support to this legislation and this important program. I urge you to approve it without harmful amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

(Mr. SMITH of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] to extend the food stamp program for 4 years. Before coming to Congress, I served in a rewarding, but nonpaying, position as chairman of the welfare board of a county of 250,000 population. I know that it is very important to a local government body which is responsible for administering welfare programs to know more than 1 year at a time what Federal and State programs will be available.

Local governments, to a large extent, must plan their budgets and levy their taxes 1 year in advance. They also have the problem of planning, training, and hiring a staff to administer these Federal, State, and local programs. The best kind of personnel are not obtainable in most cases for a program which is not assured of more than 1-year duration. Out of 99 counties in Iowa, 73 now have the food stamp program and 10 others have for some time requested the program. A county can hardly request such a program and undertake its administration if they are not assured that it will last more than 1 year.

Local governments and farmers have a great deal in common when it comes to the need for planning and for knowing the basic program under which they will work. When the farm bill comes up I

intend to offer an amendment to extend it for 4 years also. I think the food stamp and farm programs in their basic forms need to be extended 4 years at a time. These amendments do not prevent the Congress from changing the program in some future year, but it does assure the general framework will be available and that local governments and farmers can plan at least to that extent.

The food stamp program has become an important program in meeting the needs of persons with inadequate income and also in helping meet the problems and responsibilities that county governments face. In the 73 counties which are participating in the program in Iowa, there are more than 28,000 persons receiving food stamps who invest about \$375,000 of their own money per month for \$575,000 worth of food coupons. In other words, the food stamp program helps them stretch their money 50 percent further and means that more meat, milk, poultry products, vegetables, and fruits can be included in the diets of these low-income individuals and facilities much more of a market for products that we have the ability to raise. It also increases the retail activity benefits for grocers and other merchandizers who also help to support the community in various ways.

High protein products, including livestock and dairy products, are needed in greater quantity by most low-income people and the food stamp program has especially increased the demand for this kind of products which, to a large extent, is converted from corn and soybean meal which is in plentiful supply.

It is difficult for some people who have always had all the food they wanted and considerably more than they needed to understand that there are children who have seldom been able to eat a whole tomato, a whole orange or a whole banana because their families budget for food was so lean that whenever these kinds of foods were available, each child in a large family could have but a small portion. These kinds of foods together with protein foods are badly needed if children are to become strong and healthy citizens who can contribute to the fullest extent to the well-being of our whole society. Tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and nonfood items are prohibited so that the needed foods will be purchased.

I urge the adoption of this 4-year amendment to help remove the uncertainty which State and local governments now face about the future of this important program. I stress again that local government, county governments, local welfare agencies, and others concerned need to plan more than a few months ahead just like the farmers of this country need to plan more than a few months at a time in order to finance their operations and I urge you to support both this Sullivan amendment for a 4-year extension of the food stamp program and also an amendment to be offered on the farm bill for a 4-year extension of that program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

I should like to commend the gentlewoman from Missouri for her leadership throughout the years on this question. I was pleased to join her in introducing H.R. 17722, which corresponds to the pending amendment. The recent television documentary produced by CBS, entitled "Hunger in America," and the report of the Citizens' Commission on Hunger demonstrated that people are literally starving to death in the United States. The Citizens Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition reported that between 10 million and 14.5 million Americans are "seriously underfed." It is time that Congress take appropriate action.

There is no reason why a fight should be waged annually for the next 4 years over whether or not the United States needs a food stamp program. Aside from the economic arguments as to the benefits derived by the farmer and businessman from the food stamp program, there is one overriding consideration which demands that the program be continued and expanded: People are starving in America. Starvation in the United States is a reality which can be ignored no longer.

The Citizens Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States last April 22 published the findings of an intensive investigation in a report entitled "Hunger U.S.A." I quote from the introduction to that document:

In issuing this report, we find ourselves somewhat startled by our own findings, for we too have been lulled into the comforting belief that at least the extremes of privation had been eliminated in the process of becoming the world's wealthiest nation. Even the most concerned, aware, and informed of us were not prepared to take issue with the presumption stated by Michael Harrington on the opening page of his classic, *The Other America*:

"to be sure, the other America is not impoverished in the same sense as those poor nations where millions cling to hunger as a defense against starvation. This country has escaped such extremes."

But starting from this premise, we found ourselves compelled to conclude that America has not escaped such extremes. For it became increasingly difficult, and eventually impossible, to reconcile our preconceptions with statements we heard everywhere we went. . .

1. Hunger and malnutrition exist in this country, affecting millions of our fellow Americans and increasing in severity and extent from year to year.

2. Hunger and malnutrition take their toll in this country in the form of infant deaths, organic brain damage, retarded growth, and learning rates, increased vulnerability to disease, withdrawal, apathy, alienation, frustration and violence.

William Chapman graphically described the conditions of which the Commission spoke in a story in the New York Post of July 10, 1967:

NEGRO MALNUTRITION SEEN RIFE IN MISSISSIPPI

(By William Chapman)

BELZONI, Miss.—Gussie Shaw and her fatherless brood of four had bologna sandwiches for breakfast—the squarest meal of the day.

The alternatives were rice or grits or beans or one of the five cans of meat that the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the state of Mississippi allot them each month.

There is never any milk or fresh meat or fruit. The drinking water comes from a community faucet that drips slowly by the side of an alley renamed, in a now-forgotten enthusiasm for beautification, "Ladybird Avenue."

The absurd question is asked and Gussie Shaw explodes:

"Of course the kids are hungry! Vernora, come here and show the man."

She lifts the blouse on the skinny 5-year-old girl and exposes, along with the frill chest, a stomach blotched with sores—"risings," Mrs. Shaw explains, "and the home remedy never did no good."

The Shaws of Ladybird Avenue and their counterparts throughout rural Mississippi have become, to their surprise, featured symbols of a new national alarm.

Negroes in Mississippi are starving, a team of distinguished doctors declared recently—starving in the sense that acute malnutrition shortens their life span, dying young from an accumulation of hunger-induced diseases that go untreated for years.

The doctors, who will present their story to a Senate Subcommittee Tuesday in Washington, found children suffering with parasitic diseases—trichinosis and hookworm; children with skin shrunk by malnutrition; children with ulcerating sores, boils, abscesses, rat-bites; children who could not undergo even minor operations without first receiving blood transfusions.

"Malnutrition," said the physicians' report, "is not quite what we found. They are suffering from hunger and disease and directly or indirectly they are dying from them—which is exactly what 'starvation' means."

MANY YOUNGSTERS UNDERWEIGHT

The non-medical observer touring Mississippi can find with ease what the doctors discovered.

In Belzoni, self-proclaimed "Heart of the Delta," many Negro children get up hungry and go to bed hungry.

"They come in the morning and don't even stop at the classroom," observes Willie Mae Burns, director of a voluntary Head Start program for preschoolers.

"They just walk right to the kitchen and ask for something to eat. We give them some bread to hold them until they get the hot lunch."

Practically all the children of Ladybird Avenue are visibly underweight. Sores left from untreated infections spot their bodies. Most have runny noses, the observable signs of never-ending summer colds.

Raw sores cover the chin and mouth of Sharon Pearson, aged 22 months. Her mother, Odessa, says that a doctor diagnosed the case two months ago as chicken pox and gave her a cheap salve that healed nothing.

"You don't go to the doctor unless it's life or death," says Bessie Thurman. "You do what you can at home. You fight the fever with everything you've got. I waited too late for one of mine. He died."

BEANS, RICE, POWDERED MILK

The staple diet on Ladybird Avenue is determined by what the commodity food distribution center downtown is handing out.

Usually it is beans, rice, margarine, peanut butter, raisins, powdered milk, and one can of meat for each person in the family.

"I get it once a month and it lasts a week and a half," Mrs. Shaw says. The rest of the month she charges at a neighborhood grocery and tries to pay the bill when her \$43 welfare check comes in.

"The commodities are just no good," interposes another Belzoni mother.

"They give you this rolled wheat and the kids won't eat it—all it does in my house is draw the roaches. You eat the commodities when there's nothing else, and sometimes not even then."

What the doctors found is nothing new for Mississippi nor is it limited to this state. Poverty-induced hunger can be found throughout the rural South, in the dark corners of Appalachia and in Northern city slums.

It has been spotlighted in Mississippi because the physicians toured on behalf of a voluntary Head Start program, friends of the Children of Mississippi, and as a result of a visiting Senate subcommittee headed by Sen. Joseph Clark (D-Pa.).

Whether hunger is more widespread in Mississippi than in other Southern states is debatable. Welfare checks are smaller here; state appropriations are sufficient to pay only 27 per cent of what is considered the standard needs of people on welfare.

MANY NEGROES UNEMPLOYED

Furthermore, women with dependent children recently received notices that their checks will be smaller next time because the state's two year appropriation is running out.

An untabulated number of Mississippi negroes are completely unemployed this year for the first time in their lives. Many who earned \$3 a day chopping cotton have been discharged from Delta plantations because in February they were placed under the Federal minimum-wage law.

Another factor is the uneven transition Mississippi is making from one type of Federal food aid to another. Most counties have had the commodity distributions, free bags of foodstuffs that the Department of Agriculture wants to get rid of. However, this year county after county has been switching to the food stamps program which allows the poor to buy coupons worth more money for regular foods bought in commercial markets. Midway in the transition it was discovered that many Negroes could not afford the minimum purchase requirement for food stamps. Their free commodity foods were taken away but nothing replaced them.

Mr. Chairman, the time for Congress to acknowledge the magnitude and intensity of the problem is long overdue. It is not a problem which is going to disappear in the next year or the year after that, especially with a program which the committee bill proposes to authorize at a level of \$245 million a year. Indeed the Secretary of Agriculture testified that it would require at least \$325 million to accommodate all of the areas of the country which have already requested to be included in the program, but which cannot be included because of lack of funds. It is disgraceful that there are over 200 counties or independent cities which the Secretary has certified eligible for the program, where Americans are going hungry, and yet food stamps are not available for lack of Federal funds.

The Sullivan amendment is a statement of recognition of the scope of the problem and a commitment to deal with it. Hunger in America will not vanish by itself overnight, but society has a long-range obligation to feed the hungry until it can provide all of its citizens with the type of job skills which will enable them to earn a decent living.

Although the Sullivan amendment would eliminate annual authorizations for 4 years and remove the ceiling on the amount of funds to be authorized for the

food stamp program, each year the House will still have to pass an appropriations bill to fund the program. Therefore, financial control of the program will still rest with Congress on a year-to-year basis. But the Congress will have committed itself through fiscal year 1972 to a program which, according to the committee report, has benefited more than 2,750,000 of the underfed of this country.

The Secretary of Agriculture in commenting upon his approval of Washington, D.C.'s, application to participate in the food stamp program said on June 2, 1965:

As a relatively new development in the food and agriculture field, the Food Stamp Program represents a dignified and business-like way of helping low-income families purchase more food and obtain better diets. Through utilizing the existing commercial distribution system, the benefits are spread throughout the economy—right back to the farm.

Under the Food Stamp Program low-income families exchange the amount of money they normally spend for food for an allotment of food coupons of a higher monetary value. The difference between the amount a low-income family pays for coupons and the value of the coupons they receive represents the Federal Government's contribution to the family's increased food purchasing power.

Participating retail stores treat the coupons just like their other store receipts. They can immediately redeem them at a commercial bank. The banks, in turn, are reimbursed by the Federal Reserve System. So, the commercial food distribution system and the commercial banking systems are used to get more food to needy people and to redeem the coupons accepted by retailers. This means that neither Federal, State, nor local governmental units need to establish special organizations to carry out these functions.

The Food Stamp Program was operated on a pilot basis for three years. The pilot operations were subjected to very careful research in an effort to measure the actual results of the program. What we learned from the research has real significance for both low-income families in the District and for the entire economy of the city.

For the families who take part in the Food Stamp Program, the studies showed:

The program allowed them to buy more and better food.

Most of their increased food expenditures—in fact, 80%—went into buying more fruits and vegetables and livestock products.

More than twice as many participating families had fully adequate diets than when they were being helped by the commodity donation program.

The ability of these families to buy more fruits and vegetables was an important factor in this improvement of diets.

Mr. Chairman, the Sullivan amendment eliminates section 2 of the committee bill, a provision which it is difficult to believe any Congress in this day and age would seriously consider. Section 2 consists of two restrictions upon eligibility for the program. The first prohibits any person not enrolled in the program who goes on strike from then joining the program. Perhaps 30 years ago this might have been conceivable, but three decades after the Wagner Act recognized the right to organize and bargain collectively, it is antediluvian to encourage using the threat of starvation as a weapon in labor disputes.

Equally shocking is the section 2 prohibition upon participation in the program by any student attending an institution

of higher learning, unless he was enrolled in the program before he entered that institution. Why should Congress discourage the underprivileged from obtaining an education? Why should the food stamp program be denied to needy college students?

With an ever-increasing number of people unable to find jobs for lack of space-age skills, will the problem be aggravated by quashing the dreams of those who would rather sacrifice today than collect welfare tomorrow? The Sullivan amendment removes the restrictive provisions of section 2.

While I support the food stamp program, there is a major failure with the program which needs immediate rectification. The cost of the stamps, especially for families with the lowest incomes is prohibitive for those living in areas, primarily in the rural South, where there is little in the way of a cash economy. Most of the counties, which are now under the food stamp program, used to participate in the Federal commodities distribution program, whereby surplus foods, notably rice and other starches, were distributed free of charge to those in need. In most areas of the country the decision to switch from commodities distribution to the food stamp program was warmly welcomed by the participants, who were then able to buy eats, fresh fruits, and other items containing vital nutrients. But for those who have little or no cash income, it is difficult, if not impossible, to participate in the program, especially in view of the requirement that participants purchase stamps every two months. The result is that many people are even worse off than before when at least they were receiving some foods through the commodity distribution program.

An article from the Southern Courier describes this situation:

PEOPLE CRITICIZE BULLOCK FOOD PLAN: "TOOK ALL MY MONEY FOR STAMPS"

(By Mary Ellen Gale)

UNION SPRINGS.—"If I didn't raise a little hogshead and greens, I reckon we'd pass," said Mrs. Lorena Davis of Pine Grove in rural Bullock County.

And so, Mrs. Davis said, she was glad when she heard that Bullock County was handing out food stamps to poor people.

Mrs. Davis knew she would have to put up some money. But she was dismayed to learn that it would cost her \$19 for \$42 worth of stamps.

"I went on and bought 'em," she said. "But I been sick all year. I'm supposed to take medicine, but I didn't buy none last week, because it took all my money for the stamps."

Mrs. Davis, a tenant farmer, borrows money from the federal government to work her small cotton field. "The welfare don't give us a dime," she said proudly. "The food stamps is the first thing I ever took I didn't earn. I took that for my five grandchildren."

But her borrowed income is only \$20 a month, she said, and she was told to come back to the food stamp office in two weeks with another \$19 for more stamps.

"I don't see how I can get \$19 every two weeks," she said. "I can't scrap up that much money."

Mrs. Davis said, however, that she didn't tell the food stamp supervisor she had to buy medicine, "because sometimes people be rude to us when we cause too much trouble."

But now, she said, she plans to ask if there is any way that the price can be lowered

so she can buy both medicine and food stamps.

Mrs. Davis is one of several people who have discovered that the new food stamp program is complicated and expensive. Lorenzo Robbins of Midway said the stamps cost so much he can't afford them.

Robbins, a tenant farmer with ten children, had to use nearly all his earnings to pay his rent last year. This year, he said, his only regular income is the \$100 a month he is paid for attending adult education classes.

The food stamp office told him he would have to pay \$52 for \$122 worth of groceries. Robbins said: "I told them I had no money. They told me the landlord would loan it to me. Now you know the landlord won't loan you no money."

"I told them to forget it. I said I wouldn't get no benefit out of it."

Mrs. Sarah Smith of Union Springs supports three children on a welfare check and odd jobs. Like the others, she said she couldn't stretch the money to buy food stamps and pay other bills.

"They won't let you get soap or washing powder with the stamps," she added. "When I asked what I could do, Mr. Law (Frank Law, the food stamp program supervisor) told me to wash in the river."

Mrs. Smith said she doesn't want the stamps, but she's afraid she'll lose her welfare check if she doesn't agree to buy them. "A lot of other people feel the same," she said.

But Law said no one would be cut off welfare for refusing to get food stamps. "This is their money," he said. "If they want to buy food stamps with it, that makes us happy. But it's their decision."

Mrs. Smith and county civil rights leaders think free surplus food would be better than food stamps.

"There's no such thing as a food stamp program that will work," said H. O. Williams of Union Springs. "It cannot benefit the people who need it most—the ones with no money at all."

But Law said the program was working. "We've approved 491 households with 2,387 persons" he said, "and more are coming in." (Food stamp distribution has been going on since June 1.)

People paid money to eat before the stamp plan began, Law said. "They're supposed to put up the normal grocery money they've been using all the time."

Mrs. Bertha Groom of Great Hope, who feeds a family of five, said that's what she is doing. "I sold two hogs to get \$10, and they gave me \$60 in stamps," she said. "I'd sell the hogs anyway when I got hungry, and I wouldn't get \$60."

"This is the best thing that ever happened to me," Mrs. Groom continued happily. "I've got more food than I ever bought in my life. I even got a steak."

The Secretary of Agriculture, under his existing authority, should at least create a new rate of exchange to reduce drastically the cost of stamps for families in the lowest income brackets. A return to the commodities distribution program is not the answer. Essential food should be available; and, where people do not have sufficient income to purchase stamps, they should be free.

The food stamp program is an important weapon in the war on poverty. However, as in so many other programs designed to meet the needs of America's neglected millions, the seriousness of the commitment has proved limited. As one of the 130 Members of the House who joined in sponsoring this legislation, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri and compliment her on her initiative and her persistence in working for an open ended authorization for the food stamp program.

Mr. Chairman, there are reportedly at least 10 million Americans who are seriously malnourished, and who are suffering from a poor diet. I believe this is a national shame that we cannot tolerate.

There are now hundreds of counties that wish to participate in the food stamp program, but the current authorization of \$225 million—and even the increase of \$20 million as proposed in this bill—will not be sufficient to cover them all.

Even if all the counties that are now on the waiting list could be included, there would still be about half of the counties in 33 States in the Nation which do not participate in the food stamp program.

Moreover, while the debate today does not center on this point, it is not at all clear that the food stamp program is really meeting the challenge of the hungry in the 1,000 counties where it now exists.

Along with the difficulties of publicizing such a program among the very poor and helping them over the hurdle of certification, the primary obstacle to complete coverage of the hungry by the food stamp program is the present schedule of charges for the food stamps themselves.

The price of the stamps was lowered in July 1967 to 50 cents per person per month for those families in the lowest income bracket—in most cases, below \$20 per month—of the Department's issuance tables. While this, no doubt, can be considered a step forward, it is wholly inadequate for those families in areas of critical poverty which have no income whatsoever. If a family of four does not have an income of \$2 per month, then it cannot buy food stamps. Since a county with a food stamp program cannot receive surplus foods under existing law, families without income in food stamp counties go hungry.

While statistics are not obtainable, there can be no doubt that families with no income exist in these "affluent" United States, living precariously on a barter economy and rarely possessing the cash which is presently required for participation in the food stamp program. In April 1967, members of the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty toured several Mississippi counties and saw with their own eyes families eking out a living without any discernable cash income.

Even Secretary Freeman, whose Department is inexplicably reluctant to admit the existence of families without income in this country, stated in a letter to Senator CLARK, dated April 26, 1967, that mechanization in the cotton fields of the South had resulted in the presence of 40,000 to 60,000 people in the Mississippi delta area with little or no cash income. In 1967, the Arkansas State

welfare director testified that more than 1,000 families in his State were "starving" because free food stamps were not distributed.

The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, during a hearing in 1967, said on this point:

What do they do? We saw an awful lot of people who were out of work and didn't have any source of income at all, and some of them in these large families—what is it that they do? I think it is difficult for us to understand. It is not just in the State of Mississippi, but in some of these other states where they don't even have a food stamp program.

Mr. Chairman, clearly a most serious weakness exists in the food stamp program. The exact magnitude of the problem is impossible to determine, since these poorest of the poor, whose manner of living is a travesty of American social and economic justice, are virtually ignored in statistical studies in this country. For example, the census income report makes no breakdown of the total number of families earning less than \$1,000 per year.

Nevertheless, it is time that the Secretary of Agriculture listened to the ringing demands of the Poor People's Campaign and, among other steps, made food stamps available to those families without cash incomes. Further, it is time that he adjusted downward a charging schedule for food stamps which leaves a family of six with a monthly income of \$60 with only \$34 each month after payment for its food stamps, to be used for shelter, clothing, and medical care.

Indeed, it may be necessary to examine the underlying legislation since the Secretary has taken the position that free food stamps cannot be issued under existing law.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of feeding the hungry must be met and for the most affluent Nation in the world to refuse to meet it would be unthinkable. Yet an effective solution to this problem cannot emerge if the food stamp program must face each year in Congress a debate which threatens its very existence. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Missouri that would provide open-ended authorizations for the food stamp program over the next 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment to this section which reads as follows:

After line 19, on page 2, strike out the period and insert:

"The Secretary of the Department of Agriculture shall utilize personnel in his department to ascertain all persons in danger of death from starvation in the United States, its trust dependencies, and in Puerto Rico, and to provide them with the food necessary to eliminate such danger to their welfare."

The reason for introducing this amendment is that I believe the legislation before us today will not actually protect against death from starvation in the United States. We are spending billions of dollars for the present programs for aiding the hungry and the poor. For a much more modest program,

perhaps a few million dollars every year, we actually could find the people who are starving, such as those among the Indians in the Southwest, and we would have a program which would actually prevent death from starvation in our country.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would like to know what part of the bill the amendment of the gentleman from Florida would amend.

Mr. BENNETT. I intended to propose an amendment to your amendment.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Did the gentleman say line 19?

Mr. BENNETT. What line should I have said?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not know. My amendment has only six lines. I do not know what you are attempting to amend.

Mr. BENNETT. It would apply to your amendment. It is an amendment offered to your amendment.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Can you tell me where it would fit in?

Mr. BENNETT. Immediately before your section, according to its terminology. I will read it again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. BENNETT. I will give you a copy.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to offer an amendment?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SULLIVAN OF MISSOURI

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT to the amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: On page 2, line 19, after the period, insert: "The Secretary of the Department of Agriculture shall utilize the personnel in his Department to ascertain all persons in danger of death from starvation in the United States, its trust dependencies, and in Puerto Rico, and to provide them with the food necessary to eliminate such danger to their welfare."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this shows how ridiculous it is to cut off debate right in the middle of an important issue like this. One point that has not even been mentioned in regard to Mrs. SULLIVAN's amendment is the question of whether strikers will be able to secure food stamps if this amendment is agreed to. I assume from reading Mrs. SULLIVAN's amendment that those sections concerning strikers and students would be wiped out of this bill. I wonder if that is the intention of the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. My substitute amendment has nothing in it which would preclude members of unions, or strikers or college students from participating in this program if they are eligible by reason of income and liquid assets.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Is it the position of the gentlewoman from Missouri that the Federal Government and the taxpayers ought to be involved in the collective bargaining process on either side?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would say to the gentleman that the whole concept of this program is to help people who have incomes inadequate to enable them to purchase a decent diet to come under the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri. The food stamp program has been demonstrated to be a successful and effective program. The arguments for a 4-year authorization are persuasive. We are asking local government units to accept the responsibility for the administration of this program. I think that they are entitled to know that this program will endure at least for a 4-year period.

The food stamp program is one of our Nation's best examples of the constructive use of our abundance of food. This program has proved itself under actual operating conditions. It gets more food to the people most in need of better diets. In accomplishing this, it uses commercial trade channels, and it helps to expand farm markets and increase farm income.

State and local governments elect to participate in the program. They establish eligibility standards, suitable to their own needs and consistent with their own welfare programs. They investigate the eligibility of applicants, using the same standards that apply to other federally aided public assistance programs. Food stamps are not a giveaway; there is no open end on eligibility.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the proposed 4-year authorization for the food stamp program, I support the proposed removal of the appropriation ceiling on food stamps, and I support the proposed requirement for a congressional review prior to each annual appropriation. I am a cosponsor of a bill, H.R. 17722, which includes these proposals.

A 4-year authorization would remove the uncertainties the States now face about the future of the program. Removal of the appropriation ceiling would contribute to the flexible year-to-year expansion of the program. And annual congressional review would permit Congress to evaluate its decision in the light of current needs.

But we should regard this as only one of many steps which must be taken to insure the elimination of hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

(Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri.

As a cosponsor of Congresswoman SULLIVAN's amendment to the food stamp program, I should like to indicate why I support this 4-year authorization without specific monetary limitations on appropriations.

The food stamp program has been operating for 7 years, free from complications and red tape for which other Government programs are criticized. In that period, the program has developed from a pilot project into a full-fledged operation involving staff, contracts negotiated with local issuing agents and certified recipients.

In my State of Pennsylvania, close to one-quarter of a million persons participated in this program during the month of May. Through it, \$15.7 million worth of foodstuffs were distributed during fiscal 1968.

In Philadelphia, my home city, 64,000 people are enjoying better diets because of this program.

If the Congress forces the States into disorderly planning, I believe that this smooth functioning, successful program will suffer.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri, which would provide an open-ended, 4-year authorization of the Food Stamp Act. This amendment was originally introduced as H.R. 17723, and I was one of its 130 cosponsors.

Fortunately, the question of whether we will continue this program is not at issue today. Its resounding success in 7 years of operation has removed any doubt of its continuation as one of our weapons against hunger in the United States.

In November 1967, 2.2 million persons were participating in nearly 900 food stamp projects; in fiscal year 1967, the total paid for bonus coupons was more than \$105 million, and the coupons were worth almost \$300 million when used to purchase food. Presently there are 1,299 areas designated under the program, and by June 30, 1968, total participation in these areas has reached approximately 2,750,000. This new figure will take the full \$225 million authorized for fiscal year 1969, leaving no room for expansion. The bill reported by the Agriculture Committee would increase the authorization by \$20 million, thus allowing a limited expansion.

A limited expansion, however, is not what is needed. There are more people

in more areas throughout the Nation who want to participate. Hundreds of additional areas have already requested the food stamp program, and the Department of Agriculture has estimated that at least a hundred more will apply in the next few months. In short, the limited expansion contemplated in the committee bill will not be adequate to reach all of the areas desiring to participate.

Mr. Chairman, it is morally unjustifiable in a nation as rich as ours to have anyone suffering from hunger. It is especially absurd to deny aid to counties and States which request such aid and are willing to set up the necessary administrative machinery to operate the programs.

For this reason, I support today the amendment to provide an open-ended, 4-year authorization of this program. This will not infringe on the right and responsibility of the Congress to control expenditures of the Federal Government; each year the Congress will conduct a comprehensive review of the program. But it will enable the Department of Agriculture to extend the food stamp program to areas which may request participation in the near future, but who have not as yet done so. It will enable the Department of Agriculture to maintain the flexibility which is so vital if this program is to have its maximum impact.

Even this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is an inadequate response to the problem of hunger in the United States, for as long as any hunger exists in the United States our job is not finished. While this amendment will do much more than the committee bill, it still seems shameful that we have to decide, not how to eradicate hunger in the United States, but which of our hungry citizens will be fed, and which ones will have to go hungry for a while longer. Our eventual goal, therefore, must be to end hunger without qualification. This amendment is an important step in the right direction.

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I regret to have to take this kind of action to get some time to speak on this subject. I listened to the debate yesterday very attentively. I did not take any time, hoping at least there would be 5 minutes under the 5-minute rule today.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to oppose the food stamp program as such. I supported the appropriation of \$185 million for fiscal year 1968. I supported the increase up to \$225 million for fiscal year 1969 in our Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Proponents of the substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] says, "We are not asking for a bank check." Then, why ask for an open

end authorization, if you are not asking for a bank check? Then you say we can control it through the appropriations process. That is the trouble with these agricultural programs. We open up the back door to the Treasury or CCC and always have to ante up the money after the fact.

What we are doing here in adopting the Sullivan substitute is giving them a blank check. I would be willing to appropriate a billion dollars or a billion and a half dollars for the benefit of the poor people in this country. I believe we have an obligation to take care of our own before we send any money abroad to feed the poor, but I want to see that this program is properly administered and that we do not just open up the floodgates. Bear in mind that in fiscal year 1969 we have \$14,495,000 in the appropriation bill for administration of the program. In the Inspector General's office, we funded in addition—and they have asked for—151 man-years of people to police this program. Why do they ask for that? It is because there is always the opportunity for some hanky-panky whether it be counterfeit stamps or collusion between grocers and bearers of stamps.

We have to be sure we do not open up the floodgates and we have to keep proper control. I suspect some time every county in the country will be covered. I have seven of the nine counties in my district who have asked for the program. I am here to defend the appropriations procedure and to keep this thing from getting out of hand.

There are other objections I have to this substitute. The gentleman from Alabama just touched on it, having to do with the permitting of strikers and students to participate in the program.

When we permit strikers to participate in the food stamp program, what do we do to the whole collective bargaining process? Is there not a very delicate balance that has to be struck between labor and management in the negotiating of a contract? When I went to economics class in school many years ago, we had a kind of rule of thumb: 25 percent for food, 25 to 30 percent for housing, and so on. Now, I think we pride ourselves in bringing the cost of food to the American people down to 18 percent of the average family's income. So what do we do if we provide food stamp assistance to strikers on strike and give them for all practical purposes 18 percent of their income by way of a Federal subsidy? Are we not upsetting that delicate balance between labor and management when a strike is resorted to as an economic weapon in the collective bargaining process? Why, of course we are.

Let me read from the Detroit Board of Commerce last year:

During the Ford strike, 3,809 families in Detroit, representing 16,970 individuals were given \$273,171 worth of food stamps in the month of October. A second government office had to be set up to handle the volume of business (and the strike lasted only 46 days).

The Wall Street Journal had this to say:

"Food stamps are making a tremendous difference in our ability to hold out," says Orley W. Shirley, financial secretary of Local 425 at Ford's Loraine, Ohio assembly plant. He

estimates that as many as 75 per cent of the local's 4,700 members will make use of food stamps before the strike ends.

Also in the Wall Street Journal on November 30, 1967, we read:

Seven hundred families of copper strikers in Anaconda, Mont., are using Federal food stamps.

The New York Times reported on February 13, 1968:

The solidarity of the copper strikers seems to be a blend of many factors . . . And one of the most important is that many strikers receive wide support from a combination of public welfare, Federal food stamps and union strike benefits. Steel union local's members in Anaconda, Mont., are getting strike benefits of \$12 to \$24 a week in the 8-month copper dispute . . . 500 are believed to be getting county welfare payments of about \$100 a month, and almost all of them receive Federal food stamps, which provide about a week's free groceries each month.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the committee bill remedies this situation with appropriate language, but the Sullivan substitute carries no such prohibition against those out on strike and the questionable students who qualify for food stamp assistance.

Now, on this later point, I have no serious objections to providing food stamp assistance to a struggling family attempting to better their education; but unless some stringent guidelines are drawn, I can foresee practically every college student qualifying for food stamp assistance, for he could claim that his income level was below those standards set by the respective States.

When the demonstrations were going on at Columbia and Northwestern Universities, I took the floor of this House and made some comments to the effect that if I found any one of our four children carrying on in such fashion, as those demonstrators, I would "cut their water off short"; and I suspect that in a case like that a college student could plead that his folks have forsaken him and that he was destitute and therefore qualified for food stamp assistance, but that would not be the case for most as I would expect my kids under those circumstances to get out and work to make up the difference. I would personally resent the Federal Government intervening and giving to my own kids what I would not give them myself.

I heard some real bleeding hearts yesterday on this subject during general debate, but some of those individuals expressing themselves also had to perform a considerable amount of work themselves in getting through college back in those days. I just happen to harbor the old-fashioned view that it does not hurt our young people to have to go out and scratch a little bit for their education and to make some sacrifices for it. I submit that it all helps to build a better man or woman in the end.

So in summation, Mr. Chairman, may I say again that I support the committee bill that will provide for an additional \$20 million for the food stamp program over the current fiscal year level, which is \$60 million more than was being spent in the fiscal year 1968.

This additional money should provide for an orderly expansion of the program

in most of those counties asking to get into the program, but which have been denied up to this point by lack of funds or more properly because of the expenditure limitation imposed by this Congress some short time ago.

I hope the members of the Committee will see fit to vote down the Sullivan substitute and support the committee proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I previously asked in the House for permission to include the following table showing the maximum monthly income per family of four permitted in the various States as a condition precedent to qualifying for participation in the food stamp program:

Alaska	-----	\$325
Alabama	-----	175
Arkansas	-----	190
California	-----	285
Colorado	-----	244
Connecticut	-----	315
District of Columbia	-----	250
Georgia	-----	215
Hawaii	-----	250
Illinois	-----	280
Indiana	-----	275
Iowa	-----	295
Kansas	-----	(¹)
Kentucky	-----	200
Louisiana	-----	165
Maine	-----	271
Maryland	-----	185
Massachusetts	-----	180
Michigan	-----	264
Minnesota	-----	290
Mississippi	-----	180
Missouri	-----	270
Montana	-----	253
Nebraska	-----	279
New Jersey	-----	310
New Mexico	-----	215
New York	-----	325
North Carolina	-----	195
North Dakota	-----	295
Ohio	-----	260
Oregon	-----	258
Pennsylvania	-----	245
Rhode Island	-----	245
South Carolina	-----	160
South Dakota	-----	250
Tennessee	-----	200
Texas	-----	190
Utah	-----	205
Vermont	-----	205
Virginia	-----	195
Washington	-----	290
West Virginia	-----	250
Wisconsin	-----	260
Wyoming	-----	300

¹ Qualify under same procedure as to qualify for public assistance.

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposal to strike out the enacting clause—a proposal to kill the bill.

ALL THE FACTS NOT GIVEN

When the gentleman who proposed this amendment just mentioned that some \$273,000 in food stamps were "given" to the Ford strikers during a certain month, he neglected to read to us exactly what the Detroit Board of Commerce actually reported in its letter to the Committee on Agriculture. It is in

the hearings. The Board of Commerce of Detroit reported that 3,809 families of Ford strikers paid \$157,420 to obtain \$273,000 in food stamps, or a bonus of \$115,420 in food purchasing power. So this was not a case of \$273,000 in food stamps being "given" to the strikers. They paid two-thirds of the cost of those food stamps out of their own money. When you consider how many tens of thousands of Ford workers were on strike at the time, it is interesting to note that only 3,809 were actually in such financial straits to enable them to qualify for food stamps, and those who did receive them received an average of about \$30 worth of bonus coupons per family. And there was an average of five persons in each of those families—16,970 persons—so we are talking about \$6 per person for 1 month. This is the "scandal" we are supposed to get all excited about when food stamps are available to families where the breadwinner is on strike or is engaged in a "labor dispute."

But this legislation and this food stamp program were not devised just to help someone who might be on strike.

STRIKERS NOT ELIGIBLE MERELY BECAUSE THEY ARE STRIKERS

No one—I repeat, no one—receives food stamps because he is a striker. Some strikers eventually become eligible for food stamps for only one reason—they cannot afford to buy enough food to feed their families properly. They must come within the income limitations, which are generally low. In addition, and this is extremely important for the Members to know—they must not have stocks, bonds, savings accounts, credit union shares, or other liquid assets greater than those generally permitted to a welfare client in the same State.

We are talking about human beings and their families who are down to rock bottom, or close to rock bottom, because of the existence of a labor dispute. Perhaps the employer refused to bargain, or locked them out. Suppose, if this amendment carried, you had cases of workers on strike for long periods of time and the courts held the employer was guilty of forcing them out on strike, and ordering the men paid back wages. That has happened in numerous cases. The back wages will not repair the damage done to hungry children by malnutrition.

Would you also deny food stamps to illegitimate children? To children of felons? We do not deny free food handouts to strikers under the direct distribution program. Why do it on this program?

No one is going to choose to go on strike in order to get food stamps. A strike vote is a terribly serious, fateful decision. No union hopes or expects a strike to drag out long enough to enable the workers to qualify for food stamps. The only strikers who can get them are those with families not able to get enough to eat.

THE "SCANDAL" OF THE 16 KEARNEY COLLEGE STUDENTS

My understanding of the reason for the college student part of the amendment is that a handful of students, about 16 married students at Kearney State College, Nebraska, were getting food

stamps. Apparently, the welfare office of that county decided they needed this help. Are we gearing up the full majesty of the Government of the United States to keep 16 students at Kearney College, probably under the GI bill, from getting \$6 worth of added food purchasing power a month? If they are cheating and do not need this help in order to eat properly, the local authorities have the power now to exclude them. Are we to assume that all college students are rich? What about the fellow who comes out of the Army and decides to go to college on the GI bill?

JUSTIFICATION FOR OPEN END AUTHORIZATION

Mr. Chairman, I know that some of the Members are reluctant to vote for an open ended authorization on any program. Usually, a standing committee having jurisdiction over a government program comes to have a strong and sympathetic interest in the program and wants to see it succeed, or else abolishes it. So if the committee sets a ceiling on appropriations, it can usually be counted on to review that program from time to time and come forward promptly with new and higher ceilings where appropriate. This legislation is in a different category. The committee which has jurisdiction over this program does not really like the program—in fact, during the hearings there was a long discussion in the Agriculture Committee to the effect that this legislation really belonged before some other committee—any other committee.

Last year, after the food stamp program authorization expired July 1, it took until late September to get enabling legislation enacted—because the conferees from the Committee on Agriculture did not care if it died forever. This is an intolerable legislative situation for those of us—a majority of the House—who believe this is a good program.

On the other hand, the Appropriations Committee—tough as it is—has always treated this program with openminded objectivity, and has supported it with funds necessary to enable it to expand. It has never been extravagant with the food stamp appropriation—it has always cut close. Under my amendment I think we can trust that committee to watch this program with the same care and diligence that it watches all other programs of the Government. If it proposes too high an appropriation, the Members can act to reduce it on the House floor; if the proposed appropriation is too low, we can seek to raise it. But we can appropriate what the House feels should be spent, and not be limited to an arbitrary ceiling set by a hostile legislative committee.

OTHER OPEN-END AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZATIONS

There is nothing unusual about an open-ended authorization on Department of Agriculture programs. There is no ceiling on the funds which can be spent on wheat certificates, or cotton supports, or feed grain supports, or peanut supports. If there is a ceiling on Public Law 480 expenditures for giving food away abroad, it is now so fantastically high—about \$7 billion—we could never approach it. There is no ceiling on appro-

priations for meat inspection, or poultry inspection, or many other Department of Agriculture programs.

And there is no arbitrary ceiling either on the free food direct distribution hand-outs, on which we are now spending \$11 per person per month, compared to the average cost of \$6.73 a month for those on the food stamp program.

One of the reasons we cannot put a realistic ceiling on this program is that the food stamp program, which started from a tiny beginning of only eight counties 7 years ago, is now up to nearly 1,100 counties—with hundreds of additional counties waiting to come into it. We do not know in advance how many persons in those counties will elect to participate. It is purely voluntary. A new project always starts out with a very small number of participants and gradually increases in size. That has been the pattern in almost every new county. It requires a lot of educational work to get low-income families to come into it. They find it hard to understand the requirements, and to save up the money to buy the stamps once or twice a month. Many of them do not think they have been spending nearly as much for food as the food stamp regulations require them to do. They have to be taught the advantages, particularly to their children, of making the sacrifice of spending for food some of the money they would prefer to spend for other things. The participation in the program, in the areas which now have it, has risen by 22 percent in the past year. This is wonderful—it is what we want. But it has meant a substantial increase in the Federal cost of the program.

SAVINGS TO GOVERNMENT WHEN FOOD STAMPS REPLACE DIRECT DISTRIBUTION

Just remember, however, that when you start a food stamp project in a county, you automatically end the direct distribution program there, which costs almost twice as much per person as the food stamp program. That is a big saving to the Government. But the food stamp program depends on appropriations, and the direct distribution program does not. Is it not worth increasing the appropriation for food stamps a little bit in order to save a whole lot in the cost of the other program? Each dollar you appropriate for the food stamp program means nearly \$2 not being spent for direct distribution.

Furthermore, many of the 3,500,000 people now getting free food, at a cost of \$11 per person per month, are not poor enough to qualify for the food stamp program. We know that from the investigations made by the General Accounting Office, and the experiences in those counties which changed from direct distribution to food stamps. Nearly half of those getting free food were found to be not really eligible for it and could not qualify for food stamps, because their incomes or resources were too high.

So, by changing over from one program to the other, you save about \$4 of Federal funds for every \$1 of Federal funds spent on food stamps in any county which makes the change.

A dollar ceiling on this program would result, each year from now on, as it has in the past year, in great uncertainty

among the counties which want the program but do not know if they can be included.

The Secretary of Agriculture has said he would need at least \$325,000,000 instead of the current appropriation of \$225,000,000 this year in order to include all the counties which have asked for it. That still would leave about half the counties in the country outside the program. There are, so far no counties in Arizona, Oklahoma, Idaho, Florida, Delaware, or New Hampshire ready to come into the program, but I am sure they will want to do so. New York City has not yet requested it. Neither has Missouri, for any area except St. Louis. In all of those States, the grocers want it; the welfare people want it; the poor people want it.

If you set a dollar ceiling, no matter how high, it could not be an accurate or realistic one, because we do not know when all of the states now outside of the program will pass the necessary legislation to enable them to come into it. Why deny this program to their citizens, if every additional dollar we spend on food stamps to bring in new areas means a saving of \$4 in cost of the direct distribution program in those same areas?

AREAS WAITING TO COME INTO THE PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, in order to understand the necessity for adopting my substitute amendment, you need only look at the long list of counties in the United States which want to come into the program and could not do so under the committee bill. There are hundreds of such counties. They have all requested the program and are prepared to participate in it as soon as funds can be made available. None of the counties in this list can look forward to participation in the food stamp program, now or in the foreseeable future, if my amendment is defeated and the committee bill passes in the form in which it was reported.

AREAS WHICH CANNOT ENTER THE PROGRAM WITHOUT PASSAGE OF THE SULLIVAN SUBSTITUTE

Mr. Chairman, there are 1,027 counties or independent cities throughout the country participating now in the food stamp program. About 239 additional ones have been waiting since last December—when they were certified for it—for funds to become available so that they could begin to participate. All of them were assured that the \$255,000,000 included in the budget for fiscal 1969 would enable them to start the program by July 1, 1968, at the latest, and many were expecting to start in May or June of this year. Out of these 239, only 72 are going to be admitted to the program this month, and some additional ones possibly in August or September, but all of the following counties will remain on the waiting list indefinitely until more funds can be provided, even though they have been ready since last December to start: PREVIOUSLY SCHEDULED TO OPEN IN JULY BUT NOW DEFERRED (115)

Alabama: Mobile County and Montgomery County.

Alaska: Anchorage area, Dillingham area, Fairbanks area, Juneau area, Ketchikan area, Nome area (balance), Seward area.

Arkansas: Columbia County, Garland County, Union County.

California: Alameda County.

Colorado: Chaffee County, Fremont County, Grand County, Lake County, Routt County, Teller County.

Georgia: Chatham County, Polk County, Upson County.

Illinois: Boone County, Bureau County, Carroll County, De Kalb County, Du Page County, Ford County, Fulton County, Grundy County, Henderson County, Henry County, Jo Daviess County, Kane County, Kankakee County, Kendall County, Knox County, Lake County, La Salle County, Lee County, Livingston County, Marshall County, McHenry County, McLean County, Mercer County, Ogle County, Peoria County, Putnam County, Rock Island County, Stark County, Stephenson County, Tazewell County, Warren County, Whiteside County, Will County, Winnebago County, Woodford County.

Louisiana: Caddo Parish.

Maryland: Wicomico County and Worcester County.

Michigan: Allegan County, Barry County, Benzie County, Branch County, Clare County, Clinton County, Eaton County, Grand Traverse County, Hillsdale County, Isabella County, Mason County, Muskegon County, Ogemaw County, St. Joseph County, Shiawassee County, and Wexford County.

Minnesota: Cook County, Le Sueur County, Mille Lacs County, and Sibley County.

Montana: Glacier County.

New Jersey: Cumberland County and Hudson County.

New Mexico: Bernalillo County.

North Carolina: Guilford County and Rockingham County.

Ohio: Ashtabula County, Medina County, Ross County, Sandusky County, and Shelby County.

Pennsylvania: Butler County, Cameron County, Centre County, Elk County, and York County.

South Carolina: Aiken County, Anderson County, Charleston County, Greenville County, Greenwood County, Lancaster County, Lexington County, Pickens County, Richland County, Spartanburg County.

South Dakota: Beadle County, Brown County, Codington County, Davison County.

Virginia: Fairfax County, including cities of Falls Church and Fairfax.

Washington: King County and Pierce County.

Wisconsin: Barron County and Eau Claire County.

PREVIOUSLY SCHEDULED TO OPEN IN AUGUST BUT DEFERRED (16)

Arkansas: Washington County.

Louisiana: St. Tammany Parish.

Michigan: Alger County, Delta County, Dickinson County, Genesee County, Saginaw County.

Montana: Valley County.

Ohio: Fulton County and Huron County.

Pennsylvania: Berks County, Delaware County, Monroe County, Northampton County.

Utah: Salt Lake County and San Juan County.

OTHERS DEFERRED INDEFINITELY (14)

Louisiana: De Soto Parish.

Massachusetts: city of Boston, city of Cambridge, city of Dracut, city of Pittsfield, city of Quincy, city of Revere, city of Springfield.

Michigan: Antrim County and Schoolcraft County.

Mississippi: Alcorn County.

New York: Schoharie County.

North Dakota: Foster County.

Ohio: Noble County.

ADDITIONAL AREAS SEEKING PROGRAM

The following additional areas have also requested food stamp projects and cannot possibly be admitted unless the appropriation is increased substantially above the \$225 million presently authorized or the \$245 million proposed in the committee bill:

RECENT ADDITIONAL REQUESTS FOR FOOD STAMP PROGRAM (115)

Alabama: Elmore County and Tuscaloosa County.

Arkansas: Scott County.

California: Monterey County and Sacramento County.

Colorado: Ouray County and San Miguel County.

Connecticut: City of Bridgeport, city of Norwich, city of Torrington, city of Middletown, city of Stamford.

Georgia: Newton County, Dooly County, Wilcox County.

Indiana: Brown County and Sullivan County.

Iowa: Fremont County, Worth County, Bremer County, Muscatine County, Monroe County, Polk County, Boone County, Webster County, Adair County, Page County.

Kansas: Leavenworth County and Johnson County.

Kentucky: Bracken County, Christian County, Edmondson County, Fulton County, Hart County, Lewis County, McLean County, Metcalfe County, Owen County, Boone County.

Louisiana: Sabine Parish, Lafourche Parish, St. Bernard Parish; Jackson Parish, Lincoln Parish, Bienville Parish, Tangipahoa Parish, Webster Parish, East Feliciana Parish.

Michigan: Baraga County, Mecosta County, Cass County, Livingston County, Montcalm County, Ionia County, Menominee County.

Minnesota: Meeker County, Steele County, Norman County.

Mississippi: Rankin County, Tippah County, Pearl River County, Sharkey County.

Montana: Missoula County, Richland County, Hill County, Musselshell County.

Nebraska: Madison County, McPherson County, Lincoln County, Logan County, Webster County, Hayes County, Frontier County, Furnas County, Hitchcock County, Richardson County, Adams County.

New Jersey: Hunterdon County, Essex County, Morris County.

North Carolina: Richmond County, McDowell County, Davie County, Pitt County, Catawba County.

North Dakota: Divide County, Renville County, Adams County, Griggs County, Nelson County, Stutsman County, Pembina County.

Pennsylvania: Forest County, Warren County, Lancaster County.

South Dakota: Hanson County, Miner County, Hyde County, McCook County, Perkins County, Charles Mix County, Douglas County, Edmunds County, Aurora County, Lincoln County, Lake County, Walworth County, Jackson County.

Tennessee: Henderson County, Bradley County, White County, Carter County, Rhea County.

Virginia: City of Virginia Beach and City of Hampton.

Wisconsin: Buffalo County.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment to strike out the enacting clause, an amendment intended to kill the bill. I urge instead that the substitute be approved, so that this program can expand to include many more undernourished or malnourished Americans of low income.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

(Mr. MARTIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment from the gentleman from Missouri, whose amendment omitted restrictions on the sale of food stamps to both strikers and college students.

I rise in support of the amendment which will be offered in a few minutes by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] to include the restriction on the issuance of food stamps to college students and strikers.

Mr. Chairman, in my hometown of Kearney, Nebr., according to the welfare director, food stamps were issued to 57 families during the month of May 1968. Of this number, approximately one-third were college students. In Lancaster County, the home of the great University of Nebraska, of 98 nonpublic assistance households issued food stamps during the month of May, 45 households were college students, according to the welfare director, Mr. J. Earle Traver. According to Mr. C. A. Petersson, Douglas County welfare administrator in Omaha, approximately 15 families receiving food stamps during the month of May were college students.

I feel that this bypasses the intent of the Congress in that the food stamp program is primarily one for the poor and those on relief. This was never intended to be an aid to education program.

A reporter for the Kearney State College paper at Kearney, Nebr., interviewed 19 college students who have used the food stamp program. Let me quote from some of their findings:

Dozens upon dozens of beer cans, intermingled with what appeared to be several days garbage were heaped so high it spilled over and occupied the entire corner of the apartment. This was the scene at a two room residence, plus bathroom, located within walking distance of downtown Kearney.

Near the open window sat an ex-service-man, now a junior at Kearney State College,

and one of those students who applied for and received Federal food stamps from the Buffalo County Welfare Agency.

He was asked, "Have you ever abused the program?"

"We weren't allowed to purchase cigarettes, alcohol, nor foods which were not for human consumption (like cat or dog food), but I got around that," he said. "I bought Quinine water and pop for mixed drinks. That was a good deal because I could trade the bottles for deposit and use the money to buy cigarettes."

He went on to say he bought cat food for his cat. "They (the food store) wouldn't sell me the canned food, but they did the dry," he said.

In another case, four students, who resided together and had participated in the program, said they were warned to keep their food separate, but one tanned 20 year-old college junior, said, "We didn't though, we continued to buy our food and keep it all together."

Two students admitted they went out and bought the "thickest steaks they could find" the day they received the stamps. However, "there is nothing that says they can't," said one local county welfare spokesman. "If they want to throw it all away on steak the first day and starve the rest of the week, that's up to them," she added.

All student purchasers said they were required by the welfare officials to produce proof concerning their assets—stocks, bonds, savings accounts, medical bills, income, rent, utilities, and cooking facilities.

"I just took them a copy of my bank statement and medical bills," said one married student.

Twelve of the nineteen students interviewed also said they presented them with bank statements as proof of assets. A married student added, "I had nothing to hide."

In contrast, a 20 year-old KSC senior said one of his roommates "had to transfer his bank account to his parents" before he could qualify.

"There were four of us in our apartment and we were all on the stamps," said one student athlete. "It really got me when I went down there. In fact, it especially bothered me because we certainly were not destitute," he said.

The ex-serviceman, however, said it did not bother him at all. He believed he was as deserving as some other people who were allowed the stamps. He added, "I might as well get my back scratched, too."

"We always wore old clothes when we went down to buy food stamps," said one KSC senior, but he admitted he felt a little guilty when he and his roommates drove down to the welfare office in one of their cars. They owned, "an air-conditioned Buick, a real sharp T-Bird, and a Lincoln Continental," he said, and added, "that was what made me feel a little guilty."

Mr. Chairman, if this is typical of our colleges in Nebraska, it most certainly is probably going on among college students throughout the country.

The Federal food stamp program is a good program, and it should be continued, but for the poor and those on relief, rather than for college students and strikers.

I urge the adoption of the Teague amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, last year I commented on this program at page

H6913 of the RECORD of June 8, 1967, pointing out its flaws, as follows:

First. It is not coordinated with other Federal, State, or local welfare programs.

Second. It requires the welfare family to spend a prescribed portion of family income on food whether or not this is the family's primary need at the time.

Third. It is administered at high cost by the Agriculture Department. It should be under a Federal, State, or local department concerned with welfare.

Fourth. It pays a full profit markup on each dollar of subsidy provided. No one should make a profit from welfare needs.

Fifth. Its application over the Nation is spotty and inequitable. In December of 1966, only 42,074 Ohioans received help, while 411,205 from Mississippi benefited.

Sixth. It encourages States to avoid their responsibility for participation in and support for legitimate welfare programs.

These defects in the program have been substantiated by the performance since, and the program should be radically overhauled or abandoned.

Mr. Chairman, to enact the Sullivan amendment would be to compound the program's defects—not merely to continue them.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the food stamp program and emphasize the need to support a 4-year authorization without specific monetary limitations on appropriations.

Much has been done by the Department of Agriculture's food stamp program, but much more needs to be done. Experience has shown us that the food stamp program is the most efficient method yet devised to move more nutritious food to more low-income people. I am sure that we all agree that this program must be adequately financed so that it can be further expanded; and that the program needs effective congressional direction, leadership and program review. Congresswoman SULLIVAN's amendment to the food stamp bill provides for such measures.

In needy family feeding, the food stamp program is reaching almost 2.5 million persons in 43 States and the District of Columbia.

Even so, there is need for further expansion of the program in the fight to eliminate the problem of hungry Americans. The food stamp program is the kind of family food assistance program we need to operate and to fund if we are to move forward in the way we should.

The food stamp approach has strong support and appeal among the State and local officials to whom USDA looks to get the food assistance job done.

I, therefore, strongly support Congresswoman SULLIVAN's amendment to the food stamp bill. This amendment provides for a 4-year authorization without specific monetary limitations on appropriations. But, to assist and guide the Congress in its annual funding decisions, the amendment requires specific rules for an in-depth congressional review prior to each annual appropriation. It will thus permit the Congress to make its decisions each year in the light of the then current situation. A 4-year authorization will remove the uncertainties which the States now face about the future of the program, and will implement the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion. The national

need to make a full commitment to eliminate hunger dictates the need for such action.

Above all, Congresswoman SULLIVAN's substitute eliminates from the original bill a provision prohibiting the distribution of food to certain individuals. Are we so budgetary minded that we may deny to a striking worker food for his family? Are we that callous that we now foist qualifications on hungry faces? Has this Congress become so hard that they would even ask an individual his background before offering him a meal? I submit that the only question that anyone should be asked is "Are you hungry?"

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentle lady from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. This amendment bypasses the Appropriation Committee and places no limit on the amount of food to be distributed. Such action will open up endless abuses. There is already much scandal in the program I will support what is needed. It is foolish to authorize food that is not needed. I cannot give a blank check to the administration on this matter.

I support the increase in the 1969 authorization for the food stamp program as is in the original bill. The extra \$20 million—raising the total for fiscal year 1969 to \$245 million—will help bring this program to around 3 million people. I believe this is a fitting time for some observations on the problem of hunger, for separation of fact from fancy, for reflecting on just what is being done, for brief consideration of the entire scope of Federal welfare programs, and some acknowledgment of the man who ultimately pays the bill: the American taxpayer.

Earlier this year two reports—one written, prepared by an unofficial organization calling itself the Citizens Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, and the other, a television documentary called "Hunger in America"—generated shock and concern and meant a barrage of letters to Congress demanding something be done.

"Hunger—U.S.A." had flatly charged that:

Hunger and malnutrition exist in this country, affecting millions of our fellow Americans and increasing in severity and extent from year to year.

The report designated 256 counties as "emergency hunger counties" and implied widespread starvation in these areas.

The House Committee on Agriculture wrote directly to the health officers in each of these counties, asking if there were cases of starvation or serious hunger—as the report alleged—because someone could not obtain food through various relief programs. Of all the counties responding—by June 17 of this year, when the committee's report was released, 181 of the 256 had done so—there was not one case of starvation, and few of serious hunger. There were many instances of something completely different from either hunger or starvation, and not necessarily connected to or a direct resultant of either: that was malnutrition, something grappled with daily by home economics and welfare workers who find the problem with many families

is not alone in getting food, but in getting and preparing the right kind of food.

Many of the replies to the committee noted that no one from the citizens board had visited the county designated. The Committee on Agriculture determined what the citizens board had actually done was take data collected over the years on population, income, mortality rates, et cetera, extrapolate the results, and from this conclude that certain levels of data meant the given area suffered from "emergency hunger."

In addition, a study made by a staff member of the Institute for Defense Analyses of "Hunger—U.S.A." says the findings of the citizens board were based on factual error, lack of knowledge, and too much emotion. I quote from IDA's report, entitled "Hunger U.S.A.—A Critical Review":

It is unfortunate that a report of this importance should contain so many factual errors and manifest a lack of basic knowledge of nutrition. . . . It must be considered more of a political polemic than a scientific treatise. It seems to stir up action based on emotional appeal. As a scientific document it fails to supply the necessary information to direct the energies of the responsible people into the proper channels of corrective measures.

Then, in May, a nationwide TV documentary called "Hunger in America" gave the impression that the situation was even worse than indicated in "Hunger—U.S.A." The House Committee on Education and Labor asked the Secretary of Agriculture for a report. On May 27, 1968, the Secretary responded, calling the TV program "biased, one-sided, dishonest." It contains "gross errors of fact." Other facts "were completely ignored." Individual cases "were presented in such a manner as to convince an average viewer that they represented the norm for food aid recipients throughout the United States, which they do not."

Both reports, seem to have been made with more of an eye for sensationalism than for presenting the truth of the matter; both left the clear implication that no one took notice of hunger and malnutrition and nothing was being done.

Ignored was the fact that close to 36 million Americans, at an annual cost of over \$900 million, take part in the entire Federal food program. 12.5 million children get free lunches at school; 6.5 million children get lunches at less than cost; 10 million children get free milk during the school day; 6 million people get surplus food or participate in the food stamp plan; 1.3 million people receive food donated to charitable institutions; 160,000 children in low-income areas get free meals from a new school breakfast program.

And even this is but one small part of the mammoth overall Federal welfare and aid-to-the-poor program that costs close to \$30 billion annually. It makes up one-sixth of the entire Federal budget; a budget now grown to such a size that it means a Federal expenditure of \$334,094 per minute; \$20 million per hour; over \$3.3 billion per week.

The burden of all this—heavy, and getting heavier—is on the backs of the

American taxpayer and most of it is on the middle-income American, whose personal income is between \$5,000 and \$15,000 per year. These Americans—men and women—file 45 percent of all personal income tax returns, and pay over 50 percent of all personal income taxes collected. They support upwards of 1,200 different programs of Federal assistance of one kind or another to individuals, communities, and localities. They do it with a minimum of grumbling and a maximum of resignation. In one way, they are, indeed, "forgotten" but in another they are the most remembered of our day, because it is to them and to their pockets the Federal Government turns and returns, over and over again, to finance its operation.

I conclude with an article from the March 21, 1968 Washington Post; mismanagement and poor administration is endemic to Government programs. I will ask unanimous permission to insert this editorial at the conclusion of my remarks. If the taxpayer is going to be burdened with the support of these things, the very least his Government owes him is competent administration.

AID FOR POOR TIED UP IN BUNGLE

(By Eve Edstrom)

A \$10-million Federal program to attack starvation and malnutrition among the Nation's poor got hung up yesterday in a bureaucratic bungle.

It was a prime example of how difficult it is to get Government agencies charged with working for the poor to work with each other.

The emergency program to provide food and medical aid is to be a cooperative effort of the Agriculture Department, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

OEO was so certain that agreement had been reached that it began distributing copies of press releases, dated yesterday, to offices of interested Congressmen.

This allowed Sen. Ralph W. Yarborough (D-Tex.) to announce that seven Texas counties were among the 256 high-priority counties in 21 states that would benefit from \$5 million of the funds.

But when OEO was queried about its news release, it said it had been delayed for "unknown" reasons.

The "unknown" turned out to be the Agriculture Department, which had approved the program a month ago, then asked that it be modified less than 24 hours before OEO was ready to announce it.

All sources in the Agriculture Department's Consumer and Marketing Service, which will receive \$2.2 million from OEO under the program, asked not to be quoted by name.

They said they didn't want to kill, delay or change the program but wanted the funds reallocated and certain phases of the program to go in "different directions." They refused to comment on reports that they wanted more of the \$10 million, particularly for food stamps.

Money for the program was added to OEO's budget last year. OEO's announcement yesterday said that one-half of the funds would be administered principally by its community action agencies to provide food and medical supplies to families in the high-priority counties.

Agriculture's \$2.2 million would be for special projects such as providing free food stamps for families that cannot afford the 50 cents per capita minimum purchase price. The remaining \$3 million would go for demonstration programs, such as diet supplements, and aid to and identification of those not reached by existing programs.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SULLIVAN

Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, because it is exactly as it reads in the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of California to the amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: At the end thereof strike the punctuation marks and add the following: "and section 5(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is engaged in a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to the existence of a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as a result of engaging in such strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is a student attending an institution of higher learning shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided further*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to being enrolled as a student at the institution of higher learning, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as the result of being a student attending an institution of higher learning.'"

Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. Chairman, this is simply an amendment to restore the language of the committee bill, should the Sullivan amendment be adopted, to prohibit the use of food stamps for students and strikers. It seems to me it is not the intention of the Congress to promote strikes or aid students in this way. It does not mean we are against organized labor or students, but we are for helping people who cannot get jobs or who for other reasons are eligible for food stamps. The provision is not retroactive.

I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TEAGUE of California) there were—ayes 85, noes 86.

Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TEAGUE of California and Mrs. SULLIVAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 150, noes 134.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] as amended by the

amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. SULLIVAN and Mr. BELCHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 151, noes 138.

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN]. Many of us from both sides of the aisle have been privileged to join her as sponsors of the proposal, which would act to remove the authorization ceiling from the food stamp program. This would allow the program to expand so as to reach more needy, hungry persons.

At the recent hearings on this matter, held before the Agriculture Committee, much information was presented which provides convincing evidence that a substantial expansion in the food stamp program is needed, now. It was brought to the attention of the committee that many counties have requested that a food stamp program be established in their jurisdiction, but these programs have been delayed due to lack of funds. In December of 1967, 194 areas were designated for new food stamp programs. But these could not become operational for more than 6 months after their approval, until fiscal year 1969 funds were available. In addition 45 counties were designated to begin program operation at some later time in the fiscal year. And on top of that are 160 additional cities and counties which have requested a program, but have not yet received final approval.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in his testimony before the committee, admitted that the proposed \$20 million increase in authorization would not provide adequate funds for all of the requested programs to be implemented. He estimated that about \$100 million in additional budget would be needed to support them. The advantage of the amendment under consideration at this time is that it would allow the food stamp program to expand naturally, and as quickly as necessary to meet all needs. It is not as if we would be requiring a specific high figure to be spent for programs where they are not wanted or needed. Funds would be available as needed to fund new and existing programs.

During the past year, the nutritional problems of the Nation's poor have received much attention. When those examining the needs of low-income families find inadequate diets, hunger, and malnutrition widespread among children and adults, they naturally inquire into the performance of those food programs which are intended to help the poor. Both the food stamp program and the commodity distribution program are designed to feed needy, hungry people. But the program statistics show that these two programs reach only one person in five below the poverty level, thus failing to provide assistance to some 24 million persons.

As public officials across the country have become aware of the existence of hunger, many have expressed interest in establishing food stamp programs in their communities. But, as we have seen, the current level of funding is not high enough to permit the operation of programs in all of the counties which have requested them. I would like to see the food stamp program in every city, town, and county where there are needy people. I consider a minimum diet a basic right of every American citizen. Every person who is eligible should have the opportunity to benefit from the purchase of bonus food coupons.

The lack of sufficient funds has affected a number of areas in Massachusetts, areas which are anxious to participate in the food stamp program, have submitted applications and received approval, but are now waiting for funds to be made available. It is my understanding that when the Congress enacted the Food Stamp Act in 1964, it was not intended as a pilot project, only to be put into operation in a limited number of places. At that time, many thought it should entirely replace the commodity distribution program. The legislation places the responsibility for requesting and setting up the program with the local government. But now we are in a position where funds are not sufficient to allow those programs now in operation to provide stamps to every eligible citizen, or to encourage programs to be started in other places where there is proven need for them.

Mr. Chairman, the time for action is now. We need not wait for further surveys, studies, and reports. We do not need new legislation. We have a reasonably successful program already in operation. I can see no logical argument as to why it should not be expanded so as to be available to everyone.

At the present time only 2 million persons are able to take advantage of the food stamp program. During fiscal year 1967, coupons costing about \$105 million were purchased and used to obtain food worth almost \$300 million. The program has been successfully expanded, with the number of projects increasing from 43 in August 1964 to more than 1,000 at the present time. The number of participants likewise rose, from 350,000 at the beginning of the program to over 2 million now. There is every indication that this trend would continue, with more and more counties establishing programs, and increasing numbers of persons benefitting from them. But one obstacle stands in the way—the ceiling on appropriations which may be spent for this purpose.

I urge the Congress to act favorably on this amendment. This is a compassionate Nation. It is also an affluent Nation, one which is fortunate enough to have the resources to provide all of its citizens with a decent minimum standard of living, including adequate food. Our compassion cannot allow us to continue to ignore the plight of the 30 million poor in our midst, nor the 10 million who are malnourished.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I

have listened to a great many recitations of figures showing the number of counties covered and not covered by the food stamp program. As I understand the matter, out of the 1,000 poorest counties, there are still 331 counties which are not covered by the food stamp or commodity programs. It has been estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture that the demand on June 30 of this year for eligible persons in existing food stamp areas, will absorb the full \$225 million authorized for fiscal 1969. The committee bill would increase the authority to \$245 million. This seems to be an arbitrary figure that does not have relation to the overall need.

The need was expressed by Secretary Freeman when he testified before the House Agriculture Committee in June. The Secretary testified that to meet present short-run needs, to reach all the counties that have not been reached, it will take \$100 million more than the current authorization. The long-term needs, that is, to provide a mature, efficient program to reach all of the people would cost about \$1.5 billion according to the Secretary.

In our great United States with its great prosperity, it is inexcusable that areas of the country should exist where inadequate quantities of food with nutritive quality is unavailable to American citizens.

The food stamp program is not a "giveaway." It does require some contribution by recipients, even as low as 50 cents per person each month. Yet, some families have been found that can barely accumulate any amount of money that calls for a monthly family participation.

I know full well that expressions have been obtained from officials in counties around the country that might be needy for food and that these officials have indicated a lack of necessity for such programs. I have not, however, seen expressions from the poor families themselves indicating a lack of need. I wish that we might hear from them, as well as the county officials. Some of these officials may have political philosophies that are out of sympathy with the needs of the people. They may feel harassed from long years of rebutting pleas for aid. However, there are poor people in our country still; they do have problems of hunger. The evidence of their condition will not go away. The Poor People's March, broadcast programs, and constant reiterations in the press remind us of that need.

Accordingly, I support the amendment that would make this food-stamp program open ended. There is not much logic in having a food-stamp program that reaches some of the counties and not others where there is need of it. The justice of the situation would call for a uniform availability of the food programs, including food stamps in all areas.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment to authorize such sums as may be necessary, and to extend the bill through the fiscal year 1972.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, while the proponents of the amendment to the Sullivan substitute try to justify their position, most of us know it is an in-

direct but powerful weapon in the area of antilabor legislation.

We are forced by the circumstances we find ourselves in to vote for the Sullivan substitute containing the Teague of California amendment, which many of us opposed as well as exposed.

The Teague amendment calls for the denial of food stamps to members of organized labor, although they may be in dire need, if they are members of a union on strike.

To say the least this is a dangerous precedent in the fair enterprise and free labor system.

What happens when the majority votes for a strike and members of the minority view need help in the area of food stamp distribution?

Under this new view of antilabor pressure, the member either starves or scabs for his employment and food.

Surely labor disputes have no place at the hunger counter when it is the women and children, innocent bystanders to a labor dispute, who pass their empty plates.

There are some who say nobody starves in this country because of labor disputes. If this is so then why prohibit the issuance of stamps to strikers?

Stamps are only given when need is proven.

If two families are in need, living alongside of each other, and one is a strikebound worker, would you in good conscience say to one family, "eat" and to the other: "Stay away from the table." You would not, I am sure.

So why, then, do you vote for the amendment?

A man on strike goes with the majority—he is often locked in—in the same manner as those of us opposed to the strikebreaker amendment have to accept it in a package, or, refuse food stamps to all our needy people.

Finally, a man on strike being denied and his family being denied reminds me of the loud and bitterly complaining Members of Congress who fight every pay raise and then after it passed they are, oh so reluctantly, forced to take the pay raise.

Maybe in much the same way members of unions vote against strikes but get all the benefits.

In fairness to justice could we then deny all contracts from the U.S. Government, all grants and subsidies to any management or corporate interest that locks out its workers? I am sure this will never happen from what I have seen on the floor today.

I do not suggest it but perhaps the antilabor forces would like to square themselves with their consciences.

One saving grace I am sure rests in the hope the conference committee will remedy this uncalled-for restraint.

It might have been in vogue in early years of our lives but it is out of step in today's concepts of labor's rights and industry's freedom in labor-management discussions and disputes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, the juxtaposition of H.R. 18249, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, and H.R. 17126, to extend the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965, on today's calendar, offers the

House of Representatives a clear-cut opportunity to choose between the interests of the people versus the privileged few. This is a test of the views of this membership on our national priorities and directions in this crucial year 1968. The decision is quite simple: Are we to feed the hungry in all sections of our land by expanding the food stamp program as proposed in the Sullivan amendment I am proud to cosponsor, or are we to deny them and yet allocate billions to those who reap huge profits from a subversion of the agricultural program?

We quibble over extending the food stamp program for 4 years with an appropriation of "such sums as may be necessary" to reach the hungry whose plight is a national disgrace. At present, only about one-third of the counties in the United States are able to participate in this program to assure adequate diets for low-income families. The application of my own Essex County, which includes Newark, is pending before the Department and its approval must await additional funds. The proposed increase in the ceiling to \$245,000,000 as provided in the committee bill now before us will not be sufficient to cover all the cities and counties wishing to give decent diets to families who cannot afford to buy nutritious food on their meager income.

The Nation was shocked recently by the documented cases of children literally starving to death in some of the very States where corporate-type farms receive from \$100,000 to \$500,000 annually in payments under the Agricultural Act of 1965. A proposal for a modest guaranteed annual income for the poor is treated with shocked indignation, but there is no protest about the really handsome guaranteed annual income enjoyed by these huge farm enterprises. Is it not inconceivable that this House would allow our poor to go hungry while at the same time it would seriously consider an extension of this monstrous farm program that has resulted in huge windfalls to large owners and corporations for not planting crops? These so-called farmers have put to shame the biblical injunction "as you sow, so shall you reap." They do not sow but they reap bountiful harvests of public funds wrung from the hard-pressed general taxpayers. I venture to say that these beneficiaries also utilize most advantageously the loopholes so thoughtfully provided in our tax structure and thereby evade taxes on their "welfare checks."

It has been estimated that the American taxpayers could save \$600,000,000 a year by putting a ceiling of \$10,000 and no more paid to any single farm. I personally favor the outright rejection of extending this program for even 1 year. That failing, I urge that a payment limitation amendment be adopted, precluding any payment in excess of \$10,000 which is surely more than a fair return for idleness.

There is reason for deep concern in the indifference, even hostility, of too many Members of this great body toward the pressing problems of the less privileged members of our society. We cannot let so many Americans remain shut out from our society, condemned to

hopelessness and hunger, while their fortunate fellow citizens enjoy windfalls under a farm program that would be ridiculous if it were not so serious. I deplore this robbing the poor to pay the rich, this spirit of meanness and pettiness that begrudges food to the hungry and showers billions upon corporate-type farm operations. I implore this House to be worthy of its responsibilities and to vote on these two bills in the people's interests.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support a 4-year authorization for food stamp program as set forth by an amendment to the food stamp bill introduced by Congresswoman SULLIVAN.

The food stamp program has been proved, through more than 7 years of testing, to be a good program. Experience has shown us that the food stamp program is the most efficient method yet devised to move more nutritious food to more low-income people. I am sure that we all agree that this program must be adequately financed so that it can be further expanded; and that the program needs effective congressional direction, leadership and program review. The amendment to the food stamp bill introduced by Congresswoman SULLIVAN provides for such measures.

While the food stamp program will not, of itself, assure that the food problems of the poor will be solved, program availability is the essential first step—the step upon which the Department of Agriculture can work to refine program operations in an effort to reach and improve the diets of all eligible needy families.

The problems of hunger—at times, for some poor families—and of malnutrition—for larger numbers of poor families for longer periods of time—are a present-day fact. The ultimate goal, the positive commitment, must be: No American should go hungry or suffer from malnourishment.

I, therefore, strongly support a 4-year authorization, without specific monetary limitations on appropriations, which would require specific rules for an in-depth congressional review prior to each annual appropriation. This will permit the Congress to make its decision each year in the light of the then-current situation. Additionally, a 4-year authorization will remove the uncertainties which the States now face about the future of the program, and will implement the policy of orderly and progressive year-to-year expansion.

The national need to make a full commitment to eliminate hunger dictates the need for such action.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, experience with the food stamp program since 1961 demonstrates that it is a practical and prudent approach to the food problems of the poor.

Therefore, I strongly support the amendment to the food stamp bill introduced by Congresswoman SULLIVAN which provides for a 4-year authorization without specific monetary limitations on appropriations.

The program proved to be a flexible one—where changes and refinements were made as operating experience was

gained by the Department of Agriculture and by the participating States. And it is becoming increasingly clear that the events of the past year have placed new demands upon the food stamp program—

More poor people are coming in to be certified in counties that have the stamp program, as program provisions are being refined; and

More counties want the program and they should have it.

And, there are demands that even more be done to see that even more people are reached and that even more assistance is provided to those already being reached.

These demands must be taken into account when we discuss future program funding and expansion. If we are to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in this country, we must provide the Department of Agriculture with tools that are equal to the task.

It is also clear that we cannot fund, or have the Department of Agriculture place into operation, the food stamp program nationwide this fiscal year. But, we must see that the momentum that has been built up continues and, in fact, that we have the Department accelerate the pace during this fiscal year. The times and the national need require our support of Congresswoman SULLIVAN's food stamp amendment.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri. This amendment is identical to H.R. 17786, a bill which I am proud to be cosponsoring along with the gentlewoman from Missouri.

It is unfortunate, but true, that poverty and malnutrition still exist in the midsts of this affluent society. The food stamp program, which I supported in 1964 when it went from a pilot project to a permanent activity, is a valuable factor in the diets of 2.5 million Americans living in poverty in nearly 1,100 counties across the Nation.

At this time, however, the food stamp program is at a critical crossroads. Hundreds of additional counties now have requested the program, but unless the Sullivan amendment is adopted, these counties will not be able to participate. Twelve of these counties happen to be in my own State of Pennsylvania, but this is a program for which the need has been proven across the entire Nation as well.

To permit expansion of the food stamp program to every county in the land that requests and needs the program, it will not be enough simply to increase the authorization ceiling from \$225 to \$245 million, as the committee bill proposes. Instead, we must make the authorization open ended, as the Sullivan amendment would do.

In addition, the food stamp program deserves to be extended not just for 1 year, under the committee bill, but for 4 more years, as the Sullivan amendment provides.

The question is not whether this program, which has been successful within its limits, should survive for another 4 years. It definitely should. As for the need to review the program periodically,

this is taken care of in the Sullivan amendment by a provision requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to make an annual report.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of hunger in the United States has been painfully dramatized for all of us in recent months. It would be tragic if Congress responded by giving the food stamp program only a slight increase in authorized funds and only a 1-year increase in its lifespan. I urge that we pass the Sullivan amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the House Agriculture Committee for recognizing the need to increase support for the food stamp program. The committee and I, I am pleased to say, see eye to eye on basic food stamp matters. First, this program must be adequately financed so that it can be further expanded; and, second, that the program needs to be carefully and prudently administered.

I, therefore, strongly support and urge my colleagues to support the amendment to the food stamp bill introduced by Congresswoman SULLIVAN. This amendment provides for a 4-year authorization without monetary limitations on appropriations. Because this amendment requires specific rules for in-depth congressional review prior to each annual appropriation, it will assist and guide the Congress in its annual funding decision and permit the Congress to make its decision each year in the light of the then-current situation.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of a congressional district which is seeking desperately to implement this program at the earliest opportunity, I rise in support of the bill to extend the food stamp plan.

I speak in support of removal of the ceiling which the basic bill will impose. I endorse, and have cosponsored, the measure introduced by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], which is geared to do what needs to be done in providing food for the impoverished here at home.

In my own district, the counties of Northampton and Monroe have been put off for months in their efforts to introduce the food stamp program. The funds are not available to expand this program to the many regions of the country which desire to participate.

Today, more than at any time in the past, we in Congress are aware of the tragedy of poverty in our society. Our awareness has been generated by the presence in our Nation's Capital of thousands of poor who came here to make their plight known.

In this measure, we have an opportunity to demonstrate our concern for the poor in our own Nation by expanding the food stamp plan to every county in our Nation which has need of it.

I urge that we meet this need now.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when Congresswoman SULLIVAN has the facts and figures to substantiate her position on legislation, as she always does, the House knows by now that she deserves full and undivided attention. Today, Mrs. SULLIVAN has the facts and

legislative tools in hand to correct an apparent error in judgment made by the distinguished Committee on Agriculture in its consideration of the Food Stamp Amendments of 1968. I urge the House to adopt the substitute language suggested by the gentlewoman, instead of the committee version of this bill. The substitute version provides a 4 year open authorization instead of the 1 year \$245 million authorization recommended by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. SULLIVAN as usual has collected the facts to substantiate her position on this issue. For example, in my own State of Illinois, 35 of 102 counties are on the waiting list for the food stamp program. All of these counties were assured that the \$255,000,000 included in the administration's budget for fiscal 1969 would enable them to start the program by July 1, 1968. It has been discovered that all of these counties will remain on the waiting list indefinitely until we provide more funds for the food stamp program, even though they have been eligible since last December. It might be of interest to list these counties; they include: Boone, Bureau, Carroll, De Kalb, Du Page, Ford, Fulton, Grundy, Henderson, Henry, Jo Davies, Kane, Kankakee, Kendall, Knox, Lake, La Salle, Lee, Livingston, Marshall, McHenry, McLean, Mercer, Ogle, Peoria, Putnam, Rock Island, Stark, Stephenson, Tazewell, Warren, Whiteside, Will, Winnebago, and Woodford. Unless the substitute is agreed to, Mr. Chairman, funds will not be provided for the needy eligible families in these counties.

There are additional factors besides this waiting list which place a question of credibility on the 245 million authorized by the committee. In addition to these counties on the waiting list, there are dozens of others that have requested to participate in the food stamp program but will be unable to do so because of the proposed short funding. I am happy to confirm that there are no Illinois counties in this category, but 115 counties fall into this group throughout the rest of the Nation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a recent tremendous spurt in interest in this program leaves additional doubts in my mind about the adequacy of the proposed authorization. In Madison County and St. Clair County, Ill., which I represent in the Congress, participation in the program jumped a phenomenal 20 percent since January 1967. In that month there were 14,689 people participating in the food stamp program in those two counties; today there are 18,501 participants. This added participation by residents of eligible counties is not a sign of failure, Mr. Chairman, but rather a definite benchmark of this program's success. It is a self-help program in which the poor buy their food coupons with self-reliance and dignity. It is not a give-away scheme.

All of these factors combined lead me to again support the gentlewoman in her efforts to amend this legislation on the floor as I did when I originally cosponsored this measure with her several months ago. I ask that the House heed the reality of the facts displayed by Mrs.

SULLIVAN and adopt her substitute so the Appropriations Committee can fund the program at the level commanded by all of the circumstances.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] whose championing of this cause and her effective advocacy of the food stamp program have earned her the gratitude of millions of her fellow Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the gentlewoman's amendment because in simple language it makes sense. Only through the device of the open-end authorization can this program receive the financing necessary and we have seen the results of 1-year financing. Thus, I support the principle of a 4-year authorization which means that the food stamp program can be a truly continuing thing rather than the "off again, on again, now you have it, now you do not," type of operation that it has been in past years.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have been one of the 130 Members who joined with the gentlewoman in cosponsoring H.R. 17721. I urge all Members to join with us in incorporating the provisions of this bill into the pending measure which is totally inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, I have received numerous communications from concerned public officials and citizens of Hudson County, N.J., who feel as I do that unless the Sullivan amendment is adopted our food stamp program scheduled to begin almost a month ago is in danger. Further, all Members will recall that last year it took until September to enact the authorization. If you do not want this to happen every year, I urge you to join with me in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, passage of this food stamp legislation should be ample warning to the American people that the costly trend toward welfare dependency upon the Federal Government is continuing unabated, and is in fact accelerating.

The Sullivan substitute has shifted this House within 1 year's time from a debate concerning the advisability of the food stamp program itself, even under stringent appropriation controls and for 1 year only, to a debate as to whether the program should now be extended for 4 years without a spending ceiling at all, and passage of the bill seems assured. Conversation is freely flowing that rural legislators are being advised by city legislators that their support of the food stamp program is necessary for friendly consideration of the farm subsidy bill.

This food stamp bill is ostensibly concerned with feeding the hungry. In my view, the way to make absolutely certain that those who are hungry are fed is to seek out these hungry people and those threatened with hunger, and by direct distribution of nourishing food guarantee that there shall be no starvation and no near starvation. All responsible Americans stand ready to finance such a program, and we should have had that program available under improvement of our system of direct distribution of agricultural commodities.

The food stamp program replaces this direct distribution with an involved system of food stamp purchases requiring an enforcement army and under which eligibility becomes a matter to be decided by an administrative agency as increased numbers of individuals who are not even on the welfare rolls become eligible for Federal Government food subsidy. The eligibility requirement reads "participants shall be limited to those households whose income is determined to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet." The Department of Agriculture then is authorized to issue the eligibility regulations which now depend upon, first, income, second, assets, and third, dependents.

It is estimated that this Sullivan substitute will require an appropriation of \$325 million annually, a raise in 1 year for this program alone of about \$100 million. What the future holds, nobody knows, but one thing is sure and that is the cost of government on the domestic front is going up, not down.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri. This does not mean that I do not believe in the food stamp program. With this Nation faced with a critical financial problem and knowing that we have many more jobs in the country today than we have people to fill them, I can see little reason to vote today for a blank check or the open end program now before us. No one has really shown us or proved to this committee that more money or more food will really solve the malnutrition or hunger problem in our country. There are several reports and studies that indicate that the real problem is not with lack of quantity but rather with selection of food to feed the family or lack of knowledge on preparation. Is there anything in this bill to improve these conditions?

I certainly do not want to see hungry people or know that children are suffering from malnutrition. I would vote for programs if we had unemployment caused by some other reason than just that someone does not want to work. I would support a program to help feed hungry children if there were not already so many others already helping. I can find no reason to turn a blank check over to any Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], which I have cosponsored as a separate bill, H.R. 17723.

I was deeply disappointed by the Agriculture Committee's action in rejecting this bill by a 26-to-4 vote. But I am confident that this measure, which already has some 130 Members as cosponsors, will be acted upon favorably by the Committee of the Whole House.

According to Mrs. SULLIVAN, who has led this struggle with such unswerving zeal, some 239 additional counties and independent cities throughout the country have applied for certification to participate in the food stamp program.

One of the most recent requests was made by Essex County, N.J., which includes the city of Newark and the six

other communities in my own 10th Congressional District—Belleville, Bloomfield, Cedar Grove, Glen Ridge, Montclair, and Nutley. And I can attest to the urgency of implementing the program in Essex, where welfare costs constitute the largest single item in the county's budget, absorbing nearly 50 percent of the total.

Mr. Chairman, unless the substitute is approved, this most vital assistance—and it is that, it is not a giveaway—cannot be extended beyond the 1,027 counties or independent cities now participating in the food stamp program.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the substitute which represents an enlightened and humane approach to one of the most basic problems besetting the Nation. It is appalling that in a nation of plenty there should be any reluctance to approve a frontal and realistic attack on hunger and malnutrition, and the myriad evils they create.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, under the limitation now in effect on debate on the pending amendment by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], with the vote scheduled to take place in just a few minutes, at 2:10 p.m., there is no opportunity to make a long speech on this issue. Long speeches are not needed, however. We have had the food stamp program in operation in some part of Pennsylvania since 1961, when it was instituted as a pilot program by the late President John F. Kennedy. We have had this excellent program in operation in my city of Philadelphia since May of 1966. I support this program, and I support wholeheartedly the amendment in the form of a substitute for the Committee bill offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri, who is more responsible than any other Member of Congress for the fact that we have a food stamp program. The present Food Stamp Law enacted in 1964 was her bill. But long before that law was passed, she introduced and got through Congress a food stamp law which the Eisenhower administration refused to put into operation.

In Philadelphia, our low-income families are grateful for the existence of this program. At the present time, there are 57,127 men, women, and children of low income in the city of Philadelphia participating in this program, and utilizing it in order to be able to buy a good, wholesome, nourishing diet.

During the first 9 months of the 1968 fiscal year, through April 1968, the people of Philadelphia participating in this program paid \$6,000,000 for about \$9,000,000 worth of food stamps—two-thirds of the cost of their food stamps. The average subsidy was only \$6 per person per month, but that made the difference for those 57,127 persons between eating well and not being able to afford enough of the right foods for proper nutrition.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] for the fight she has made for so many years for this program, and, as a cosponsor of her bill this year, I shall support her amendment which includes the text of our bill H.R. 17722.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18249) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 1260, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it possible to get a separate vote on the Sullivan amendment?

The SPEAKER. There is one amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The Sullivan amendment?

The SPEAKER. That is the Sullivan amendment, as passed.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the phrase 'not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972;' and (B) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: 'On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year' and section 5(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is engaged in a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to the existence of a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as a result of engaging in such strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is a student attending an institution of higher learning shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided further*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to being enrolled as a student at an institution of higher learning, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as the result of being a student attending an institution of higher learning.'"

Mrs. SULLIVAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to have a separate recorded vote on the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE]?

The SPEAKER. Under the present parliamentary situation, the answer is in the negative.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan demand the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. On the so-called Sullivan amendment, as amended, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 172, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—227

Adams	Gonzalez	O'Hara, Mich.
Addabbo	Gray	O'Konski
Albert	Green, Oreg.	Olsen
Anderson, Tenn.	Green, Pa.	O'Neill, Mass.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Griffiths	Ottinger
Annuozio	Gude	Passman
Ashley	Hagan	Patman
Ashmore	Halpern	Patten
Barrett	Hamilton	Pepper
Bevill	Hanley	Perkins
Biester	Hanna	Phillbin
Bingham	Hansen, Wash.	Pickle
Blatnik	Harsha	Pike
Boggs	Hathaway	Podell
Boland	Hays	Pollock
Bolling	Hechler, W. Va.	Price, Ill.
Brademas	Heckler, Mass.	Pryor
Brasco	Helstoski	Pucinski
Brooks	Henderson	Purcell
Brown, Calif.	Hicks	Randall
Burke, Mass.	Hollifield	Rees
Burton, Calif.	Horton	Reid, N.Y.
Button	Howard	Reifel
Byrne, Pa.	Hull	Resnick
Carey	Hungate	Reuss
Carter	Ichord	Rhodes, Pa.
Celler	Irwin	Riegle
Clark	Jacobs	Rivers
Cleveland	Joelson	Roberts
Cohelan	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Conte	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Conyers	Karth	Ronan
Corbett	Kastenmeier	Rooney, N.Y.
Culver	Kazen	Rooney, Pa.
Daddario	Kee	Rosenthal
Daniels	Kelly	Rostenkowski
Davis, Ga.	King, Calif.	Roush
Dawson	Kluczynski	Roybal
de la Garza	Kupferman	Ruppe
Delaney	Kyros	Ryan
Delaney	Landrum	St Germain
Dent	Leggett	St. Onge
Diggs	Long, La.	Saylor
Donohue	Long, Md.	Scheuer
Dorn	McCarthy	Schweiker
Dow	McDade	Shipley
Dulski	McDonald,	Sikes
Dwyer	Mich.	Sisk
Eckhardt	McFall	Slack
Edmondson	McMillan	Smith, Iowa
Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald,	Staggers
Edwards, La.	Mass.	Steed
Eilberg	Machen	Stephens
Esch	Madden	Stratton
Evans, Colo.	Mahon	Stubblefield
Everett	Mathias, Md.	Stuckey
Fallon	Matsunaga	Sullivan
Farbstein	Meeds	Taylor
Fascell	Miller, Calif.	Tenzer
Felghan	Mills	Thompson, N.J.
Foley	Minsh	Tlernan
Ford,	Mink	Tunney
William D.	Monagan	Udall
Fraser	Moorhead	Ullman
Friedel	Morgan	Van Deerlin
Fulton, Pa.	Morris, N. Mex.	Vander Jagt
Fuqua	Mosher	Vanik
Galifianakis	Moss	Vigorito
Garmatz	Murphy, Ill.	Waldie
Gettys	Murphy, N.Y.	Walker
Gialmo	Natcher	Wampler
Gibbons	Nedzi	Watts
Gilbert	Nix	Whalen
	O'Hara, Ill.	White

Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Willis

Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Wright

Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—172

Abbott	Fino	Nelsen
Abernethy	Fisher	Nichols
Adair	Flynt	O'Neal, Ga.
Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	Pelly
Andrews, Ala.	Fountain	Pettis
Arends	Gathings	Pirnie
Ashbrook	Goodling	Poage
Aspinall	Griffin	Poff
Ayres	Gross	Price, Tex.
Bates	Grover	Quie
Belcher	Gurney	Quillen
Bell	Haley	Rallsback
Bennett	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Berry	Halleck	Reinecke
Betts	Hammer-	Robison
Bow	schmidt	Rogers, Fla.
Bray	Hardy	Roth
Brinkley	Harrison	Roudebush
Brock	Harvey	Rumsfeld
Broomfield	Hosmer	Sandman
Brotzman	Hunt	Satterfield
Brown, Mich.	Hutchinson	Schadeberg
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Johnson, Pa.	Schneebell
Broyhill, Va.	Jonas	Schwengel
Buchanan	Jones, Mo.	Scott
Burleson	Jones, N.C.	Selden
Burton, Utah	Keith	Shriver
Bush	King, N.Y.	Skubitz
Byrnes, Wis.	Kleppe	Smith, Calif.
Cabell	Kornegay	Smith, N.Y.
Cahill	Kuykendall	Smith, Okla.
Casey	Kyl	Snyder
Cederberg	Laird	Springer
Chamberlain	Langen	Stafford
Clancy	Latta	Stanton
Clausen,	Lennon	Steiger, Ariz.
Don H.	Lloyd	Steiger, Wis.
Clawson, Del	McClary	Taft
Collier	McCloskey	Talcott
Colmer	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Conable	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Cowger	McEwen	Thompson, Ga.
Cunningham	MacGregor	Thomson, Wis.
Curtis	Mailliard	Tuck
Dellenback	Marsh	Utt
Denney	Martin	Watkins
Derwinski	Mathias, Calif.	Whalley
Devine	May	Wiggins
Dickinson	Mayne	Williams, Pa.
Dole	Meskill	Wilson, Bob
Dowdy	Michel	Winn
Downing	Miller, Ohio	Wyatt
Duncan	Minshall	Wydler
Edwards, Ala.	Mize	Wyllie
Erlenborn	Montgomery	Wyman
Eshleman	Morton	Zion
Findley	Myers	Zwach

NOT VOTING—33

Baring	Flood	Holland
Battin	Frellinghuysen	Karsten
Blackburn	Fulton, Tenn.	Kirwan
Blanton	Gallagher	Lipscomb
Bolton	Gardner	Lukens
Burke, Fla.	Goodell	Moore
Corman	Gubser	Morse, Mass.
Cramer	Hansen, Idaho	Rarick
Davis, Wis.	Hawkins	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dingell	Hébert	Waggonner
Evins, Tenn.	Herlong	Watson

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.
Mr. Morse of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Battin against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.

Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Hansen of Idaho against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Herlong against.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Blanton with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Karsten with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Goodell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BELCHER

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BELCHER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BELCHER of Oklahoma moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 18249) to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 315, nays 83, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]
YEAS—315

Adams	Conte	Gibbons
Addabbo	Corbett	Gilbert
Albert	Cowger	Gonzalez
Anderson, Ill.	Culver	Gray
Anderson, Tenn.	Cunningham	Green, Oreg.
Andrews,	Daddario	Green, Pa.
N. Dak.	Daniels	Griffin
Annunzio	Davis, Ga.	Griffiths
Ashley	Dawson	Grover
Aspinall	de la Garza	Gude
Ayres	Delaney	Hagan
Barrett	Dent	Halpern
Bates	Diggs	Hamilton
Bevill	Donohue	Hammer-
Bieber	Dorn	schmidt
Bingham	Dow	Hanley
Blatnik	Downing	Hanna
Boggs	Dulski	Hansen, Wash.
Boland	Duncan	Hardy
Bolling	Dwyer	Harrison
Brademas	Eckhardt	Harsha
Brasco	Edmondson	Harvey
Bray	Edwards, Calif.	Hathaway
Brinkley	Edwards, La.	Hays
Brooks	Eilberg	Hechler, W. Va.
Broomfield	Esch	Heckler, Mass.
Brotzman	Eshleman	Helstoski
Brown, Calif.	Evans, Colo.	Henderson
Brown, Mich.	Everett	Hicks
Brown, Ohio	Fallon	Holifield
Burke, Mass.	Farbstein	Horton
Burleson	Fascell	Hosmer
Burton, Calif.	Feighan	Howard
Burton, Utah	Fino	Hull
Button	Flynt	Hungate
Byrne, Pa.	Foley	Hunt
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford, Gerald R.	Ichord
Cahill	Ford,	Irwin
Carey	William D.	Jacobs
Carter	Fountain	Joelson
Casey	Fraser	Johnson, Calif.
Celler	Friedel	Johnson, Pa.
Clark	Fulton, Pa.	Jones, Ala.
Clausen,	Fuqua	Jones, Mo.
Don H.	Galifianakis	Karth
Cleveland	Garmatz	Kastenmeyer
Cohelan	Gathings	Kazen
Conable	Gettys	Kee
	Gialmo	Keith

Kelly	O'Hara, Ill.	Schweiker
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Mich.	Schwengel
King, N.Y.	O'Konski	Selden
Kleppe	Olsen	Shipley
Kluczynski	O'Neill, Mass.	Shriver
Kornegay	Ottinger	Sikes
Kupferman	Passman	Sisk
Kuykendall	Patman	Skubitz
Kyl	Patten	Slack
Kyros	Pelly	Smith, Iowa
Landrum	Pepper	Smith, N.Y.
Latta	Perkins	Springer
Leggett	Philbin	Stafford
Long, La.	Pickle	Staggers
Long, Md.	Pike	Stanton
McCarthy	Pirnie	Steed
McClory	Poage	Steiger, Wis.
McCloskey	Podell	Stephens
McCulloch	Pollock	Stratton
McDade	Price, Ill.	Stubblefield
McDonald,	Pryor	Stuckey
Mich.	Pucinski	Sullivan
McEwen	Purcell	Taylor
McFall	Quie	Tenzer
McMillan	Quillen	Thompson, Ga.
Macdonald,	Railsback	Thompson, N.J.
Mass.	Randall	Thomson, Wis.
MacGregor	Rees	Tiernan
Machen	Reid, Ill.	Tunney
Madden	Reid, N.Y.	Udall
Mahon	Reifel	Ullman
Martin	Resnick	Van Deerlin
Mathias, Md.	Reuss	Vander Jagt
Matsunaga	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vanik
May	Rhodes, Pa.	Vigorito
Mayne	Riegle	Walker
Meeds	Rivers	Wampler
Meskill	Roberts	Watkins
Michel	Robison	Watts
Miller, Calif.	Rodino	Whalen
Mills	Rogers, Colo.	Whalley
Minish	Rogers, Fla.	White
Mink	Ronan	Whitener
Minshall	Rooney, N.Y.	Whitten
Mize	Rooney, Pa.	Widnall
Monagan	Rosenthal	Williams, Pa.
Moorhead	Rostenkowski	Willis
Morgan	Roudebush	Wilson,
Morris, N. Mex.	Roush	Charles H.
Morton	Roybal	Wolff
Mosher	Rumsfeld	Wright
Moss	Ruppe	Wyatt
Murphy, Ill.	Ryan	Wylie
Murphy, N.Y.	St Germain	Wyman
Natcher	St. Onge	Yates
Nedzi	Saylor	Young
Nelsen	Schadeberg	Zablocki
Nichols	Scherle	Zwach
Nix	Scheuer	

NAYS—83

Abbitt	Derwinski	Montgomery
Abernethy	Devine	Myers
Adair	Dickinson	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, Ala.	Dole	Pettis
Arends	Dowdy	Poff
Ashbrook	Edwards, Ala.	Price, Tex.
Ashmore	Erlenborn	Reinecke
Belcher	Findley	Roth
Bell	Fisher	Sandman
Bennett	Goodling	Satterfield
Berry	Gross	Schneebeli
Betts	Gurney	Scott
Bow	Haley	Smith, Calif.
Brock	Hall	Smith, Okla.
Broyhill, N.C.	Halleck	Snyder
Broyhill, Va.	Hutchinson	Steiger, Ariz.
Buchanan	Jarman	Taft
Bush	Jonas	Talcott
Cabell	Jones, N.C.	Teague, Calif.
Cederberg	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Chamberlain	Langen	Tuck
Clancy	Lennon	Utt
Clawson, Del	Lloyd	Wiggins
Collier	McClure	Wilson, Bob
Colmer	Mailliard	Winn
Curtis	Marsh	Wydler
Deffenback	Mathias, Calif.	Zion
Denney	Miller, Ohio	

NOT VOTING—34

Baring	Flood	Karsten
Battin	Frelinghuysen	Kirwan
Blackburn	Fulton, Tenn.	Lipscomb
Blanton	Gallagher	Lukens
Bolton	Gardner	Moore
Burke, Fla.	Goodell	Morse, Mass.
Conyers	Gubser	Rarick
Corman	Hansen, Idaho	Waggonner
Cramer	Hawkins	Waldie
Davis, Wis.	Hébert	Watson
Dingell	Herlong	
Evins, Tenn.	Holland	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Rarick against.
Mr. Morse of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Hansen of Idaho against.

Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Karsten with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Gardner.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Watson.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. BROOMFIELD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1260, the Committee on Agriculture is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3068.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. POAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. POAGE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3068 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 18249, as passed, as follows:

"That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the phrase 'not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972;' and (B) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: 'On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year.', and section 5(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is engaged in a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to the existence of a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as a result of engaging in such strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is a student attending an institution of higher learning shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided further*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to being enrolled as a student at an institution of higher learning, such per-

sen shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as the result of being a student attending an institution of higher learning."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 18249) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3418) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10864) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Saline County, Ark., to the Dierks Forests, Inc., and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15794) entitled "An act to provide for United States standards and a national inspection system for grain, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17903) entitled "An act making appropriations for public works for water and power resources development, including certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-oceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, and the Atomic Energy Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15387) entitled "An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for disciplinary action against employees in the postal field service who assault other employees in such service in the performance of official duties, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. FONG, and Mr. BOGGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 262 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 17126, EXTENSION OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1218 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1218

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17126) to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1218 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 17126 to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

H.R. 17126 would extend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 for 1 year and contains the following provisions which would—

First, extend the class I dairymen's base plan through December 1970;

Second, extend the voluntary feed grain program through the 1970 crop;

Third, extend the present cotton legislation through the 1970 crop;

Fourth, extend present wheat certificate legislation through the 1970 crop;

Fifth, extend present wool legislation through December 1970;

Sixth, extend the cropland adjustment program through December 1970;

Seventh, extend the exemption of boiled peanuts from marketing quotas and acreage allotments through the 1970 crop; and

Eighth, extend lease and transfer authority for certain types of tobacco through the 1970 crop.

Mr. Speaker, the bill will be gone into thoroughly during debate and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1218 in order that H.R. 17126 may be considered.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement just made by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] concerning the provisions of this rule.

It is an open rule providing for 2 hours of debate.

Let me say that the Committee on Rules had this bill under consideration for quite some time. We held the bill while the question of taking this bill up for consideration this session was being debated by the various members of the Agriculture Committee. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the present farm programs extend through the crop year of 1969 and by having a 1-year extension we will have 2 more years of these same programs.

The question involved was whether or not a new administration—and we certainly are going to have a new administration taking office in January—should have the opportunity to present a new program to this Congress.

As Members know, the other body has already acted on this matter and voted for a 4-year program. By enacting a 4-year program, the Senate is telling the American farmer you shall have 5 more years of suffering under these Democrat administration programs.

The farmers of this Nation have not fared very well under these programs, and they are supposed to be for the benefit of the American farmer rather than against his best interests.

The American farmer is now receiving only 73 percent of parity for all of his labors and for his large investment.

Aug. 1, 1968

- 5 -

The conference substitute amendment regarding authorization for flood protection in the Mo. River Basin with a requirement that there be mutual agreement between the States involved on a flood control plan for mitigation of fish and wildlife losses requires this agreement to be reached in 6 months following completion of the reservoir study. This bill will now be sent to the President.

24. FARM PROGRAM. Passed with amendment H. R. 17126, to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (pp. S9998-99). Agreed to an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause of H. R. 17126 and insert the language of S. 3590 in lieu thereof (p. S9999). Conferees were appointed (p. S9999). House conferees have not been appointed.
25. FOOD STAMPS. Conferees were appointed on S. 3068, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (p. S9999). House conferees have not been appointed.
26. TRAILS. Conferees were appointed on S. 827, to establish a nationwide system of trails (pp. S10010-12). House conferees have not been appointed.
27. RECREATION. Sen. Moss called for legislation "to open up our national parks more widely" to serve more visitors. pp. S9928-31
28. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Young, Ohio, stated, "Increased trade from America with European Communist nations will also provide a powerful political tool to woo them toward peace, complete independence of Russia, and consumer orientation." pp. S9940-1
29. WILDLIFE. Sen. Yarborough inserted an article endorsing his bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the U. S. p. S9945
30. PLANNING-PROGRAMMING-BUDGETING. Sen. Proxmire stated the Joint Economic Committee supported establishing a planning-programming-budgeting system within all agencies of the Federal Government and stated that the Budget Bureau has advised the committee of its efforts to assist the agencies to adopt appropriate discounting procedures. p. S9946
31. EDUCATION. Several Senators criticized withholding of appropriations to aid the education of children attending local schools that are federally affected. pp. S9954, S9955, S10017-8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

32. RURAL AREAS. Sen. Randolph stressed the need to have rural areas livable and attractive enough to reverse the current population surge to congested urban centers. pp. E7203-5
33. CONSERVATION. Sen. Bayh stated that it is of prime importance that young Americans become acquainted with the values of conservation and inserted an

(5) By striking out "the calendar years 1964 through 1969" in section 339(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and substituting "1964 through 1973 calendar years".

(6) By striking out "the calendar years 1966 through 1969" wherever they appear in section 502 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, and substituting "1966 through 1973 calendar years".

(7) By striking out "1966 through 1969 crops" in section 506 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, and substituting "1966 through 1973 crops".

PROJECTED FARM YIELD COMPUTATION

SEC. 402. Effective beginning with the 1969 crop, section 301(b) (13) (κ) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out "three calendar years" and substituting "five calendar years".

WHEAT ALLOTMENT COMPUTATION

SEC. 403. Effective beginning with the 1969 crop, section 332(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out "owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation" and substituting "on hand in the United States".

COST OF WHEAT MARKETING CERTIFICATES TO PROCESSORS

SEC. 404. Section 379e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out "1969" and substituting "1973".

DATE FOR DETERMINING WHEAT SUPPORT PRICE

SEC. 405. Effective beginning with the 1969 crop, section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting in paragraph (1) (a) after the words "100 per centum of the parity price" the following: "as of the beginning of the marketing year as estimated by the Secretary not earlier than May 1 preceding the beginning of such marketing year."

TITLE V—WOOL

EXTENSION OF WOOL ACT

SEC. 501. Section 703 of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, is extended by striking out "December 31, 1969" and substituting "December 31, 1973".

TITLE VI—CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT

EXTENSION OF CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 601. Section 602 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) By striking out "the calendar years 1965 through 1969" in subsection (a) and substituting "1965 through 1973 calendar years".

(2) By striking out "during any of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966 through June 30, 1968 or during the period June 30, 1968 through December 31, 1969" in subsection (k) and substituting "during any of the fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1972, or during the period July 1, 1972, through December 31, 1973".

ADVISORY COMMITTEE EXPENSES

SEC. 602. Section 602(p) of such Act is amended by striking out of the last sentence thereof the words "or expenses" and inserting "other than transportation expenses and per diem as provided by section 5703(c) of title 5, United States Code".

TERMINATION OF AGREEMENTS

SEC. 603. Section 602 of such Act is amended by adding a new subsection (r) as follows: "(r) The Secretary may terminate agreements which are entered into with producers after the effective date of this subsection if he determine such action to be in the national interest and gives public notice in ample time to permit producers a reasonable opportunity to make arrangements to return their land to agricultural production."

TITLE VII—RICE

EXTENSION OF CONTINGENT RICE ACREAGE DIVERSION PROGRAM

SEC. 701. Section 353(c) (7) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out "1966, 1967, 1968, or 1969" and substituting "1966 or any succeeding year up to and including 1973".

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

EXTENSION OF TOBACCO ALLOTMENT LEASE AUTHORITY

SEC. 801. Section 316(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out of the first sentence thereof "1962 through 1969", and inserting "1962 through 1973".

RESTRICTION ON REDUCTION OF STATE AND COUNTY PROJECTED YIELDS

SEC. 802. Section 708 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The projected yield for any State or county for the 1969 and succeeding crops of any commodity shall not be less than 95 per centum of the yield established for such State or county for the preceding crop."

EXTENSION OF BOILED PEANUT EXEMPTION

SEC. 803. The last paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1957 (7 U.S.C. 1359 note), is amended to read as follows: "This amendment shall be effective for the 1957 through 1973 crops of peanuts."

MARKETING ORDERS FOR APPLES PRODUCED IN COLORADO, UTAH, AND NEW MEXICO

SEC. 804. Clause (A) of the first sentence of section 8c (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, is amended by striking out "and Connecticut" and inserting in lieu thereof "Connecticut, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio".

ADVERTISING PROGRAMS FOR APPLES

SEC. 805. (a) Section 2(3) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, is amended by inserting ", such marketing research and development projects provided in section 8c(6) (I), and" immediately after "section 8c(6) (H)".

(b) The proviso at the end of section 8c (6) (I) of such Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "or avocados" and inserting in lieu thereof "avocados, or apples".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. Boggs conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 3068.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3068) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended which was, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972;" and (B) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: "On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year," and section 5(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is engaged in a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to the existence of a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as a result of engaging in such strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is a student attending an institution of higher learning shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided further*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to being enrolled as a student at an institution of higher learning, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as the result of being a student attending an institution of higher learning."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. Boggs conferees on the part of the Senate.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3710) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous con-

sent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 29, 1968, pp. H7735-H7741, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the report comes before the Senate by unanimous vote of the Senate conferees. It authorizes the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, for navigation, flood control, and other purposes.

The House and Senate conferees met on several occasions to consider, and they did consider fully, the differences in S. 3710, the rivers and harbors-flood control omnibus bill.

We had long deliberations. The distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], guided the legislation very adroitly through the conference.

We of the Senate conferees obtained practically everything we sought to obtain, with the exception of a couple of matters to which I shall refer very briefly in a moment.

Mr. President, we have agreed on a substitute measure. In the judgment of the Senate conferees, it is a fair and equitable compromise.

The bill as agreed upon authorizes the construction of 73 meritorious projects, at an estimated cost of \$1.2 billion. This brings the total cost of the bill, including the amount of \$469 million authorized for projects in approved basin plans on which there was no disagreement, to \$1.2 billion.

This amount is slightly more than the total approved by the House, and somewhat below the amount passed in the Senate when we acted on the legislation.

I am informed that in the House of Representatives the conference report was ratified within a few minutes yesterday, and without any controversy.

In most instances we of the Senate were successful in upholding the position of the Senate. However, the House conferees would not recede in their disagreement to three items. The Senate conferees tried to be most persuasive and persistent in our argument.

The items in which the House conferees would not concur with our views included restoration of the full amount for the Red River Waterway, transfer of the Yazoo River project from title I to title II, and the Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir in Kentucky and Tennessee.

My colleague the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] fought valiantly for the Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir. He had the backing of every one of the Senate conferees, but there could be no agreement thereon.

In the case of the Red River Waterway, the Senate committee will give consideration to fully authorizing this project during consideration of the next omnibus

bill. That item was worked out in that manner.

Further consideration will also be given at that time to the Mississippi River and tributary project.

With respect to the Devil's Jump Dam, for which we pressed so hard, and for which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] pressed eloquently and persistently, but without success, he finally brought in a substitute offer, and the conferees did agree to a restudy of the project, to be made by the Chief of Engineers and other Federal agencies.

This action, I feel, will be most helpful to Congress in its further consideration of the matter, and, in reality, I feel in the end it was a very substantial accomplishment on the part of our colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. President, I feel we have a good bill here, finally, and I recommend that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this afternoon, as we consider the conference report, I wish to express tribute to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the respective leaders in their parties in the conference, and to all those who joined in discussion with the House conferees of the projects that are included in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

Senator Young and Senator Cooper and those who signed the report with them—five Democrats and three Republicans in all—were desirous of bringing back to the Senate a measure which retained, insofar as possible, the authorization for these projects, including the river basins—a total of \$1.7 billion, approximately, with some 107 projects included in that figure.

I believe the Senator from Ohio handled the measure in conference in a very helpful and realistic manner. He was chosen as chairman of the conference. The Senate and House conferees worked with him in bringing the conference report into being. I know that I benefited from the give and take, as always in conference with House Members; but the fair and courteous conduct of our conference chairman, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] deserves our accolade at this time.

The other body had added a number of projects to the bill. All these added items were examined closely prior to our meeting. Most of the projects were meaningful, meritorious projects, and were acceptable to the Senate, the Senate having acted earlier on this legislation.

There were several projects, however, in addition to those which have been mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, which required the study and deliberation of the conferees. Included among these were the Port Jefferson Harbor in New York, the Charleston Harbor in South Carolina, the Navasota River in Texas, and the Wabash River in Indiana and Illinois.

The Port Jefferson Harbor project was included in the Senate bill on its merits. It has a benefit-cost ratio of 6 to 1. Of course, this is exceptionally high—almost

unbelievably high. This project had the interest and support of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], of course, with the support of the State of New York through the Governor of that State, and was approved by all of the Federal agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget.

However, the House felt compelled to delete this item, for reasons other than the merits of the project, which I have indicated are very real. We discussed the project at length with our House counterparts. We indicated that we could not recede, in view of the case that had been established for the authorization.

As to the Charleston Harbor project, in the Senate version of the bill we provided only for negotiation between the Corps of Engineers and the South Carolina Power Authority to limit flow through that company's power facility to reduce silting in the harbor. The House has authorized, in addition to the negotiation feature, construction of a canal and a powerhouse to compensate that power company for loss of power in reducing flow on the Cooper River. This action was in accordance with the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers. The Senate conferees, after examining the factors associated with this proposal, felt justified in receding from objections to the House modifications. It was realized that the problem of silt in that harbor is most acute, and that we have a responsibility to deal with it as effectively as we can, and just as quickly as possible.

As to the Navasota River project in Texas, we feel that an adequate settlement has been made of that matter. The Senate expressed its approval of the project, providing construction of the Millican Dam, with the proviso that the Navasota No. 2 Reservoir project would be restudied prior to its construction. The conferees reached agreement by deleting the provisions of both of the Houses, and leaving the order of construction in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

The Wabash River project is another one where the conferees established a high degree of understanding of the problem. Here we were faced with differences between the Senate and the House of Representatives, and there has been a controversy as to this project, as we know, with respect to the construction of the Big Walnut Dam and Reservoir.

Our Senate committee believed that it was best to defer this project—and the Senate concurred—until such time as we could have a mutually acceptable project developed by the Chief of Engineers. However, the House indicated that the project was merited at this site and that there was a need for flood control and water supply in that valley. Accordingly, construction was authorized, but not to be initiated until further and approval by the President.

I think that the conferees, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the others agree fully with my statement that we reached what we considered to be an equitable solution to a very pressing problem.

HIGHEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued September 11, 1968
For actions of September 10, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 146

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....7	Information.....12	Poverty.....13
Economic development.....6	Lands.....5	Report.....14
Expenditures.....16	Legislative	Roads.....7
Farm program.....10,14	reorganization.....9	Scenic rivers.....2
Food.....15,18	National parks.....4	Surplus food.....18
Food stamps.....3	Organization.....17	Transportation.....8
Foreign aid.....1	Personnel ceilings...16,19	
Guam.....6	Pollution.....11	

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on foreign aid authorization bill.
House Rules Committee cleared scenic rivers bill.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN AID. Received the conference report on H. R. 15263, the foreign aid authorization bill (H. Rept. 1884). The conferees agreed on an authorization of \$1,974,050,000, against a House figure of \$1,993,850,000 and a Senate figure of \$1,945,900,000. pp. H8442-6
 2. SCENIC RIVERS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 18260, to provide for a national scenic rivers system. p. H8497
- FOOD STAMPS. Conferees were appointed on S. 3068, the food stamp bill. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. H8428



United States
of America

COPY

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Please return to
Division of Legislative Reporting
Office of Budget and Finance

Vol. 114

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1968

No. 146

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 11, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power.—1 Corinthians 4: 20.

O Thou who art seeking to lead us along the paths of freedom and righteousness and good will, grant that in these decisive days we, the leaders of our people, may make wise decisions, be strengthened by Thy spirit to stand for what is sacred in life, and be given insight to see Thy way and inspiration to walk in it.

May we keep extending to one another the handclasp of friendship as together we march forward to the great task of establishing peace on earth and good will among the people on this planet.

Give to the nations the spirit which shall turn their hearts to the right and their minds to the rights of all that the darkness may turn to dawning and the dawning to noonday bright and Thy great kingdom shall come on earth, the kingdom of love and light.

In the name of Him who makes real the kingdom we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1371. Joint resolution to provide that it be the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on Aging be called by the President of the United States in 1971, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for related purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14935) entitled "An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicle ignition switches, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-689, appointed the following Members on the part of the Senate to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference to be held in Brussels, Belgium, November 11 to 16, 1968: Mr. STENNIS, Mr. GORE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. BAYH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. COOPER.

The Vice President also appointed the following Members as alternates to the above conference: Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. SPONG, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. KUCHEL.

VIETNAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I read in this morning's paper that Vice President HUMPHREY said yesterday that it is possible that U.S. troops could be brought home from Vietnam early next year. While I know it is difficult to find much in the Johnson-Humphrey record to point to with pride, I cannot believe that Mr. HUMPHREY thinks the American people are going to fall for this old rerun of past unkept promises.

I recall that on November 20, 1963, the then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara said that American troops would start being withdrawn before year-end. Then, before a congressional committee on January 27, 1964, McNamara said that most of the 15,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam could be withdrawn before 1965 year-end. Throughout that election year the promises were piled on promises that the "boys would be brought back."

Now we have Mr. HUMPHREY following in the footsteps of the master, making the same hollow promises. I call attention to the fact that Mr. HUMPHREY has claimed that he was a part of all the major decisions made by the Johnson-Humphrey administration. He was part and parcel of the escalation into a land war in Asia. He was part and parcel of bombing halts that gave the Vietcong opportunity to regroup and resupply their forces.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the H.H.H. reruns will get a very high rating from the American public come November.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE REPORT NO. 1858

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that certain members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have permission to file minority views to accompany House Report No. 1858.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 3068, TO AMEND THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3068) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the amendment of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POAGE, GATHINGS, PURCELL, FOLEY, BELCHER, TEAGUE of California, and Mrs. MAY.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3293, AUTHORIZING MILITARY PRO- CUREMENT, 1969, AND PRESCRIB- ING PERSONNEL STRENGTH

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3293) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 5, 1968.)

Mr. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the conference report has been printed, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—will the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, take some time and is it his plan to make a statement about the differences in the bill and to allow other speakers to participate?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is what happened in the conference on S. 3293, the military weapons procurement and research and development bill.

PROCUREMENT

I will first discuss the procurement portion of the bill.

With respect to naval vessels, the Senate had granted four FDL's—fast deployment logistic ships. The House had stricken this request from the bill. The Senate receded on the FDL's.

The House added to the departmental request \$39.3 million for spare parts for the *Nimitz* class nuclear aircraft carriers. This had not been requested by the Department and had not been included in the Senate version of the bill. The Senate receded with respect to this addition.

A new kind of destroyer is to come into our naval inventory; it is now designated as the DX. Two hundred and forty-six million dollars was requested by the Department for this program and this amount was granted by the Senate. The House had granted only \$25 million for contract definition. The House receded in this instance principally on the basis of what I will call the morale boost that this authority will give to the program.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

In research and development the conferees agreed on a total of \$7.8 billion. There were many internal adjustments in the research and development area and the final figure arrived at by the conferees is about \$72 million less than contained in the House version of the bill.

RESERVES

In title III of the bill relating to the strength of the selected Reserves, there was little disagreement between the House and the Senate. The one strength figure that was the subject of conference was that relating to the Naval Reserves. The Department's request was for 125,407 personnel and this number was granted by the Senate. The House, however, on the basis of testimony received, felt that this figure should be raised by 3,000 to 128,407. The Senate receded to the House figure.

In further reference to the Reserve portion of the bill the Department of Defense requested that certain language be inserted in the bill subsequent to the presentation of the program to the Congress. The language sought by the Department would give the President authority until July 1, 1969, to order units of the Ready Reserve to active duty.

As the Members of the House will recall, the Committee on Armed Services in acting on the Department's request simply recommended, and obtained House approval, of an extension of the Presidential authority previously provided by Congress in Public Law 89-687 to order units of the Ready Reserve to active duty for a period not to exceed 24 months.

This continuation of the President's authority until July 1, 1969, therefore applies to all units in the Selected Reserve Force—Public Law 90-168—our Ready Reserve units which are in receipt of drill pay and consist of approximately 1 million reservists.

The House included this authority in its version of the bill. It had not been included in the Senate version. The Sen-

ate receded to the House with respect to this authority.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The House committee added a number of new general provisions to the bill. I will deal with each of them briefly.

The House added language which would have exempted civilian employee manning levels at naval shipyards from any numerical manpower limitations applicable to the Navy.

The conferees agreed that since other solutions to this problem should be found, a legal mandate was not desirable at this time, and the language was deleted.

The House committee had added language to the bill designed to require rapid modernization of contract commercial airlift services provided to the Armed Forces. The House language was modified in conference by deleting the effective date of January 1, 1969, and, in effect, substituting the language "as soon as practicable."

The substitute language allows the military to continue using piston-powered aircraft during fiscal year 1969 for a portion of the Air Force contract airlift known as LOGAIR.

The Department of Defense fiscal year 1969 airlift contracts for international services will be performed exclusively by turbine-powered aircraft for the last three-quarters of the fiscal year.

The economy, efficiency, and reliability of turbine-powered aircraft over piston aircraft is well-established. It is the desire of the House conferees that the domestic airlift performed for the military reap these benefits as soon as possible by insisting upon further modification of the equipment used by the airlines performing this contract service.

The House version of the bill had language, added by the committee, designed to assist State and local law enforcement and firefighting agencies in obtaining surplus equipment appropriate for use by these agencies. The Senate version of the bill contained no such language.

The Senate receded with respect to this provision and this valuable and important language will remain in the bill.

The House version of the bill contained language prohibiting the purchase, lease, rental, or other acquisition of buses other than those manufactured in the United States "except as may be authorized by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Defense solely to insure that compliance with this prohibition will not result in either an uneconomical procurement action or one which would adversely affect the national interests of the United States."

The conferees after a review of all of the considerations involved agreed that this section should be retained in the legislation.

As a result of hearings held by the Armed Services Committee it was felt highly desirable to insert language in the bill which would close the kind of loophole that allowed the Army to make the recent awards for the procurement of the M-16 rifle without considering price as an essential element. The language inserted by the committee, and agreed to by the House, insures that on future

Sept. 19, 1968

3. FOOD STAMPS. Received the conference report on S. 3068, to continue authorizations for the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (H. Rept. 1908). The revised bill extends the authorization through Dec. 1970. It authorizes \$315 million for 1969, \$340 million for 1970, and \$170 million for the first half of 1971. It omits the provision making strikers and students ineligible under certain conditions. It includes the House requirement for annual reports from the Department. pp. H8998-9
4. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Conferees were appointed on S. 698, the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. H9000
5. FOOD SERVICES. The D. C. Committee reported with amendments S. 2012, to amend the D. C. Public School Food Services Act (H. Rept. 1915). p. H9008
6. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee approved for full committee action S. 1190, relating to computation of surviving spouses' annuities of reemployed annuitants, and postponed action on S. 1507, to include firefighters within hazardous-occupation retirement provisions. p. D851
7. BORDER INSPECTION. Rep. Bob Wilson said inspection personnel on the Mexican border should be increased. pp. H8964-5
8. MEAT IMPORTS. Rep. Kleppe said a recent voluntary reduction in meat exports by Australia and New Zealand "may temporarily take some of the pressure off the domestic cattle market" but that a meat-import control law is still needed. p. H9001
9. INFLATION. Rep. Dorn deplored the Chrysler price increase as inflationary. p. H9003
10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that the conference reports on the farm and food stamp bills will be considered beginning next Wed. and that the retirement financing bill will be considered Tues. or later in the week. p. H9000
11. ADJOURNED until Mon., Sept. 23. p. H9007

SENATE

12. FARM PROGRAM. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 17126, the farm bill. The conference substitute extends the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 for 1 year and omits all other provisions of the House bill and of the Senate amendment. p. S11107
Sen. McGee inserted a paper by a small 'yo. farmer, "Farm Programs in Perspective." pp. S11083-4
13. WILDERNESS. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 1321, to establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake National Recreation Area, to designate the Pasayten Wilderness and to modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, Wash. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. S11039

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
NEW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING,
Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.
Wash. D. C. Ext. 4654

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

USDA
National Agricultural
Library
LEGISLATIVE REPORTING

SEPTEMBER 19, 1968.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. POAGE, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 3068]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3068) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not in excess of \$315,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of \$340,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; not in excess of \$170,000,000 for the six months ending December 31, 1970"; (B) by changing the word "year" at the end of such first sentence to "period"; and (C) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: "On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year."

And the House agree to the same.

W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
B. EVERETT JORDAN,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. CALEB BOGGS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill, S. 3068, to extend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

1. *Expiration date.*—The Senate bill did not extend the expiration date of the appropriation authorization of the act beyond June 30, 1969. The House bill extended this authorization to June 30, 1972. The conference substitute extends this authorization to December 31, 1970.

2. *Authorization.*—The Senate bill increased the appropriation authorization in fiscal year 1969 by \$20 million to \$245 million. The House bill authorized "such sums as may be necessary" for fiscal year 1969 and each of the 3 subsequent fiscal years. The conference substitute provides for an increase in authorization of \$90 million making a total authorization of \$315 million for fiscal year 1969, an authorization of \$340 million for fiscal 1970, and an authorization of \$170 million for the first 6 months of fiscal 1971.

3. *Strikers and students eligibility.*—The House bill made strikers and students ineligible to participate in the food stamp program under certain conditions. The conference substitute deletes this House provision and leaves the determination of eligibility to be made under the existing law.

4. The Senate receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to require progress reports of the Secretary of Agriculture on or before January 20 of each year. The conference substitute requires reports to Congress by such date setting forth operations under the act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year.

W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

(2)

○

was trying to increase the assistance figure from \$365 million to \$410 million.

Mr. Chairman, I refer the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to page 13 of the so-called committee report to indicate my concern at the nature of expenses or supplies which are furnished in this area. The various members will, of course, recognize that certain titles are not touched, such as military assistance which seems to be a sensitive program with this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that supporting assistance is about equally sensitive to the interest of this Nation. For instance, there is the sum of \$22.5 million which is to go to Latin America, including the sum of \$20 million to the Dominican Republic and the sum of \$2.5 million to Haiti. With reference to Africa there is a regional program of \$1 million and a program of \$8 million to the Congo.

In East Asia there is to go to Korea \$25 million; Laos, \$39 million; and, Thailand, \$50 million, plus the country program in Vietnam of \$451 million.

What will a cut like this mean, if the committee has done such a good job in deciding that a substantial cut can be made in these areas intimately associated with the effort now being made in Vietnam? What, specifically, do they think can be eliminated? I would suggest that we are bordering on the area when we cut in that area of supporting assistance that affect other programs now in progress.

Mr. Chairman, one will note that the committee voted for one program more than was authorized. I suggest that we get back to the authorized level would be the sensible thing to do. I regret that the parliamentary situation does not permit me to offer my amendment, but I do suggest that we may be acting unwisely.

I also regret that an amendment should be made to restore the money for the international organization because there again the example of the reduction when we consider the size of the program and its workability and our contribution to international programs I think set a precedent which others will only be attempted to follow. I might say that during the past 5 years other countries have contributed to these programs far more than the United States.

I believe seven countries contribute to the Development Fund and are contributing a greater portion of their gross national product than does the United States.

So here again I would be reasonably sure that we would be penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the committee chairman a question, if I may?

Mr. Chairman, in an earlier discussion between us when I asked about what the subcommittee had decided should be provided for the country of India in development loans, the chairman indicated that all of these proposals were illustrative, and that the AID Agency was not bound to present any particular program,

but could expend within the limitations that were provided for in the appropriation measure. Is that correct?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct as to the development loans appropriation, but they cannot transfer Alliance for Progress funds to India.

Mr. FRASER. I appreciate that fact, that the Alliance for Progress is devoted to Latin America. I am more interested in the international organizations and programs. I notice that a cut has been made of roughly some \$20 million. Could the chairman tell me which programs are specifically aimed at there?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, I can. It is upon the recommendation of the gentleman's own wonderful committee that this program is on an illustrative basis, so that it is authorized in a lump sum, and it is appropriated on an illustrative basis. AID could give it all to one program, or they could divide the appropriation in any way they see fit.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to point out to the chairman that there is a bar, or there is a direction to the President not to issue any new contributions to development programs of the United Nations which would be used for projects to help the Government of Cuba so long as it is governed by the Castro regime. That is an effort to impose a specific restriction on the use of those funds?

Mr. PASSMAN. That would be my understanding.

Mr. FRASER. But other than that specific restriction, you are not intending to cut any specific program. That is left up to the agency, as I understand it.

Mr. PASSMAN. I believe the gentleman will find that during the past 14 years there have only been two instances where we have earmarked funds. Once we earmarked funds for Spain. This year we are protecting the \$13 million for the U.N. Children's Fund. It is specifically stated in our report that no part of the cut should apply to UNICEF. The rest of the program is completely illustrative, and may be allocated by the administrator as he sees fit.

Mr. FRASER. I just wanted to make sure from what the chairman has said that the restrictions that you have intended on this money are those that are written into the statute?

Mr. PASSMAN. Nothing else but what is written into the statute.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 19908) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1308, he reported the bill back to the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 139, answered "present" 1, not voting 118, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—173

Adams	Gude	Pickle
Albert	Halleck	Pike
Anderson,	Halpern	Pirnie
Tenn.	Hanley	Podell
Annunzio	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Barrett	Hathaway	Pucinski
Bates	Hawkins	Purcell
Biester	Hechler, W. Va.	Quile
Bingham	Heckler, Mass.	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Helstoski	Reuss
Boggs	Hicks	Riegle
Bolton	Holifield	Robison
Brasco	Horton	Rodino
Brooks	Howard	Rogers, Colo.
Broomfield	Joelson	Ronan
Brotzman	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Burton, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Byrne, Pa.	Kazen	Rostenkowski
Byrnes, Wis.	Kee	Roybal
Cabell	Keith	Rumsfeld
Cahill	Kelly	Ryan
Conable	Kirwan	St Germain
Corbett	Kyros	Scheuer
Culver	McCarthy	Schneebeli
Daniels	McClory	Schwengel
Dawson	McCloskey	Selden
Dellenback	McEwen	Shriver
Diggs	McFall	Sisk
Dow	Macdonald,	Slack
Downing	Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Dulski	MacGregor	Smith, N.Y.
Dwyer	Machen	Springer
Eckhardt	Madden	Stafford
Edwards, Calif.	Mahon	Stanton
Eilberg	Mailliard	Steed
Erlenborn	Mathias, Md.	Sullivan
Esch	Matsunaga	Taft
Evans, Colo.	Meeds	Teague, Calif.
Fallon	Minish	Teague, Tex.
Farbstein	Mink	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Morgan	Tieman
Feighan	Morse, Mass.	Tunney
Findley	Mosher	Udall
Flood	Murphy, Ill.	Van Deulin
Foley	Murphy, N.Y.	Vigorito
Ford, Gerald R.	Nedzi	Waldie
Fraser	Nelsen	Whalen
Frelinghuysen	Nix	Widnall
Friedel	O'Hara, Ill.	Wiggins
Fulton, Pa.	O'Hara, Mich.	Wilson, Bob
Fulton, Tenn.	O'Neill, Mass.	Wolf
Garmatz	Ottinger	Wright
Gibbons	Passman	Wyder
Gilbert	Patman	Yates
Gonzalez	Patten	Young
Gray	Pelly	Zablocki
Green, Oreg.	Pepper	
Green, Pa.	Perkins	

NAYS—139

Abernethy
Aqair
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Blackburn
Blanton
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Cleveland
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Eshleman

Everett
Flynt
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gathings
Gettys
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Hagan
Haley
Hammer-
schmidt
Harsha
Harvey
Henderson
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kyl
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McMillan
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
May
Merrick
Miller, Ohio
Mize
Montgomery
Myers
Natcher
O'Neal, Ga.
Poage
Poff

Price, Tex.
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roush
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scott
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Staggers
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taleott
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Winn
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—118

Abbitt
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bell
Bevill
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Bush
Button
Carey
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cowger
Curtis
Daddario
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Fisher

Ford,
William D.
Fountain
Gallagher
Gardner
Gaiamo
Griffiths
Gubser
Gurney
Hall
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Hays
Hebert
Herlong
Hosmer
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Irwin
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Laird
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lloyd
Lukens
McClure
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
Mayne

Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Moss
Nichols
O'Konski
Olsen
Pettis
Philbin
Pollock
Pryor
Quillen
Railsback
Rarick
Rees
Reifel
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roudebush
St. Onge
Schweiker
Shipley
Smith, Okla.
Stratton
Tenzer
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Watkins
Watts
Wilson,
Charles H.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Jacobs

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hebert for, with Mr. Shipley against.
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Nichols against.
Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Ashmore against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.
Mr. Jacobs for, with Mr. Ichord against.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Abbutt against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Olsen against.
Mr. Gaiamo for, with Mr. Rivers against.
Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
Mr. Vanik for, with Mr. Watts against.
Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Fisher against.
Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Hungate against.
Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Bevil against.
Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Kornegay against.
Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Landrum against.
Mr. Griffiths for, with Mr. Mills against.
Mr. William D. Ford for, with Mr. Morris of New Mexico against.
Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Rarick against.
Mr. Rees for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
Mr. Moorhead for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Clancy against.
Mr. Kupferman for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.
Mr. Boland for, with Mr. Gardner against.
Mr. Arends for, with Harrison against.
Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.
Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Fino against.
Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.
Mr. Pryor for, with Mr. Hunt against.
Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Laird against.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Quillen against.
Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.
Mr. Railsback for, with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma against.
Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Pettis against.
Mr. Button for, with Mr. McDonald of Michigan against.
Mr. McDade for, with Mr. Cowger against.
Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Gurney against.
Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Hall against.
Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Hansen of Idaho against.
Mr. Brademas for, with Mr. Watkins against.
Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Vander Jagt against.
Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. Reifel against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Pollock against.
Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Latta against.
Mr. Hamilton for, with Mr. Minshall against.
Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Irwin for, with Mr. McClure against.
Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Lukens against.
Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. Lloyd against.
Mr. Buchanan for, with Mr. O'Konski against.
Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Moore against.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Karsten.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Ichord]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington one of its clerks announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution to correct errors in the enrollment of S. 827.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 827) entitled "An act to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes."

TO CORRECT ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT OF S. 827, ESTABLISHING NATIONWIDE SYSTEM OF TRAILS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) to correct errors in the enrollment of S. 827.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 79

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate, in the enrollment of the bill, S. 827, entitled "An Act to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes," be authorized to make the following correction: In section 4(a)(1) after the words "such trails are reasonably accessible to urban areas, and" and a comma and insert the word "or" and in section 4(b)(1) at the end of the paragraph delete the comma after the word "and" and delete the word "or".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3608, AMENDING FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. POAGE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3608) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1908)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3608), to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do

recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the phrase 'not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'not in excess of \$315,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of \$340,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; not in excess of \$170,000,000 for the six months ending December 31, 1970'; (B) by changing the word 'year' at the end of such first sentence to 'period'; and (C) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: 'On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year.'"

And the House agree to the same.

W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
B. EVERETT JORDAN,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. CALEB BOGGS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill, S. 3068, to extend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

1. Expiration date: The Senate bill did not extend the expiration date of the appropriation authorization of the Act beyond June 30, 1969. The House bill extended this authorization to June 30, 1972. The conference substitute extends this authorization to December 31, 1970.

2. Authorization: The Senate bill increased the appropriation authorization in fiscal year 1969 by \$20 million to \$245 million. The House bill authorized "such sums as may be necessary" for fiscal year 1969 and each of the three subsequent fiscal years. The conference substitute provides for an increase in authorization of \$90 million making a total authorization of \$315 million for fiscal year 1969, an authorization of \$340 million for fiscal 1970, and an authorization of \$170 million for the first six months of fiscal 1971.

3. Strikers and students eligibility: The House bill made strikers and students ineligible to participate in the food stamp program under certain conditions. The conference substitute deletes this House provision and leaves the determination of eligibility to be made under the existing law.

4. The Senate receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to require progress reports of the Secretary of Agriculture on or before January 20 of each year. The conference substitute requires reports to Congress by such date setting forth operations under the Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year.

W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file sundry reports on District of Columbia bills.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] to inform us as to the legislative program.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have completed the program for this week and will ask to go over until Monday following the announcement of the program for next week.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, District day, there are eight bills.

H.R. 17845, authorizing construction of parking facilities; S. 1246, District of Columbia Public Space Utilization Act; S. 1247, District of Columbia Public Space Rental Act; S. 2012, to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; H.R. 18980, to authorize the District of Columbia to convey interests in certain property in Prince William County, Va.; S. 2496, to authorize reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia; S. 2592, to provide notice of the enforcement of a security interest in real property in District of Columbia; and S. 2017, to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of District-owned buildings.

On Tuesday:

S. 945, the Federal Magistrates Act—continue consideration, and

S. 2484, extension of New Senate Office Building site—open rule, 1 hour of debate. The rule has already been adopted.

POSTPONING VOTES ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for this purpose at this point, in view of the fact that Monday and Tuesday are Jewish holy days, I ask unanimous consent that rollcall votes on other than procedural matters on Monday and Tuesday may go over until Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this again poses the question of record votes on bills that are considered on Monday and Tuesday. I have no knowledge whatever of the District bills and there are, I believe, eight of them. As to whether any of those bills are of an important nature—I mean in the sense of importance to the rest of

the country—I have no knowledge. I do know something about the Federal Magistrates Act and the Senate Office bill.

I have had difficulty in the past with respect to record votes after a piling up of measures on which record votes were demanded. I regret to say at that I was not able to get votes that otherwise would have been obtainable. I am speaking now of situations of this kind in years past.

Can we have some assurance from the leadership that record votes will be in order on the two bills scheduled—at least the two bills—scheduled for Tuesday, during that time the gentleman is asking that rollcall votes be put over? Is there any way that we can have some assurance that there will be rollcall votes on at least both those two bills if rollcall votes are sought?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, so that I may respond to him?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, this procedure is very rare, and has been since we stopped putting rollcall votes over for primaries.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman knows that the matter of rollcalls is within the judgment and power of the House itself. It is something over which I have no control. So far as I am concerned, I would say to the gentleman that I have no objection to having record votes on those measures and, speaking for myself personally, I would be glad to assist in obtaining record votes if only a few Members wanted me to do so. I will stand up for yea-and-nay votes. That is as far as I can go.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. As the majority leader knows, the Federal Magistrates Act was completed—general debate was completed. There were no amendments at the Clerk's desk. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Committee was ready to resolve itself back into the House, and there would have been a request for a vote. I am wondering if the Federal magistrates bill, since all debate is completed and there are no amendments at the Clerk's desk, could not be continued over to Wednesday, and then there would be no question. I think Members on the majority side could assure the majority leader that what I have said is a fact.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I understand that there is one technical amendment which is required for purposes of correction.

Mr. CAHILL. A technical amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. A technical amendment only.

Mr. CAHILL. That is correct.

Mr. ALBERT. We had hoped that we could get into these other bills early on Wednesday, but as far as I am concerned, I would be willing to have the Federal magistrates bill made the first order of business on Wednesday.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. GROSS. I think that would solve the problem.

Mr. ALBERT. We will schedule, then, H.R. 17682, civil service retirement, on Tuesday. However, I have been advised that the gentleman handling that bill may not be here Tuesday, in which event the bill will be considered later in the week.

Mr. GROSS. I do have that assurance of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. We will put the Federal Magistrates Act down as the first order of business, if it is down to the question of voting, on Wednesday, or, in any event, not later than immediately after the conference reports which are already scheduled.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the agreement just now reached for Wednesday and the balance of the week, we have two conference reports which we are putting down:

H.R. 17126, Extension of Food and Agriculture Act of 1965; and

H.R. 18249, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

We may or may not take these ahead of the Federal Magistrates Act, but we hope to have all three bills on Wednesday.

May I say to my colleagues also that we do expect other conference reports next week. There will probably be a conference report on the higher education bill, and there may well be a conference report on the vocational education bill. There are, of course, conferences pending on appropriation and other bills.

To make even more clear a statement I have previously made, if the gentleman handling H.R. 17682, the Civil Service Retirement Financing Act, is here on Tuesday, we would expect him to call that bill up on Tuesday. If not, he will call it up after the other bills on Wednesday or Thursday. I think that is clear.

Under the agreement made, there will be no rollcall votes until Wednesday, except on procedural matters.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the program announcements, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has asked us to add to the list of bills which he hopes to call up by unanimous consent certain other bills which have been unanimously reported from the Committee on Ways and Means. The RECORD of September 5, on page H8329, contains a list of the other bills, all of which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means hopes to call up by unanimous consent some day next week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the list of additional bills may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL BILLS REPORTED UNANIMOUSLY FROM THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

H.R. 14095, relating to the production of wine.

H.R. 15023, regulated investment companies furnishing capital to development companies.

H.R. 17332, credits and payments in the case of certain uses of gasoline and lubricating oil.

H.R. 18253, definition of earned income for pension plans of self-employed individuals.

H.R. 18373, implementing certain customs conventions.

H.R. 18486, tax treatment of income from communications satellite system.

H.R. 18942, tax treatment of certain statutory mergers.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO SEPTEMBER 23, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the distinguished majority leader give us any encouragement, any hope that we will be adjourning in the near future?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have hopes. I think the gentleman can see we are moving to conference reports, and we have very little initial legislation on the program for next week—only three bills, as a matter of fact.

I have just been advised by the gentleman from North Carolina that the scenic rivers conference report will be ready for next week, and we will expect to call it up next week one day, probably on Wednesday or Thursday of next week.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we can hope to call it up next week, one day, probably follow on the foreign aid appropriation bill will wind up in much less time than the conference on the foreign aid authorization bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's hope on that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I hope we can be out by the 1st of October, and not later than the third or fourth. They say the fishing in Iowa is improving, especially the fishing for votes, and I would like to get out there.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged Resolution (H. Res. 1310) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1310

Resolved, That James M. Collins, of Texas, be, and is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Education and Labor.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 698, INTERGOVERNMENTAL CO-OPERATION ACT OF 1968

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 698) to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities among the levels of government in order to improve the operation of our federal system in an increasing complex society, to improve the administration of grants-in-aid to the States, to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid, to permit provision of reimbursable technical services to State and local government, to establish coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of development assistance programs, to provide for the acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with local government programs, to establish a uniform relocation assistance policy, to establish a uniform land acquisition policy for Federal and federally aided programs, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOLIFIELD, BLATNIK, and REUSS, Mrs. DWYER, and Mr. ERLBORN.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 321 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 175 and 176, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Florida,

2. FOOD STAMPS. Agreed, 245-98, to the conference report on S. 3068, to continue authorizations for the Food Stamp Act of 1964. The revised bill extends the authorization through Dec. 1970. It authorizes \$315 million for fiscal 1969, \$340 million for fiscal 1970, and \$170 million for the six months ending Dec. 31, 1970. It omits the provision making strikers and students ineligible under certain conditions and includes the House requirement for annual reports from this Department. pp. H9080-88
3. SCENIC RIVERS. Agreed to the conference report on S. 119, to reserve certain public lands for a national wild and scenic rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system. pp. H9088-90
4. EDUCATION. Received the conference report on S. 3769, the proposed Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (H. Rept. 1919). pp. H9031-55
The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees on H. R. 18366, the proposed Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, agreed to file a report. p. H869
Rep. Dorn called on HEW "to release funds to every school district in our country." p. H9094
5. OLDER AMERICANS. The Education and Labor Committee reported H. R. 19747, to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965 (H. Rept. 1922). p. H9173
6. HEALTH. Received the conference report on H. R. 15758, to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and improve the provisions relating to regional medical programs, to extend the authorization of grants for health of migratory agricultural workers, and to provide for specialized facilities for alcoholics and narcotic addicts (H. Rept. 1924). p. H9065-69
7. PARKING FACILITIES. Passed with amendment (to substitute the language of H. R. 17854) S. 944, the proposed District of Columbia Parking Facility Act. H. R. 17854, a similar bill, passed earlier was tabled. pp. H9058-65
8. HIDE IMPORTS. Rep. Nelsen stated farmers "are being booted by record imports of leather footwear, depriving them of their domestic hides market." p. H9095
9. SMALL BUSINESS; LOANS. Rep. Gross spoke in support of his bill which "would prevent Federal officials, especially those within the Small Business Administration, from drawing the curtain of secrecy over certain of their loans which, of course, are made with the public's money." pp. H9095-6
10. REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK. Rep. Clausen inserted a speech on the importance of the Redwood National Park to southern Oreg. pp. H9153-4
11. CONGRESSIONAL REFORM. Several members discussed the congressional reorganization bills and Rep. Cleveland stated there is still plenty of time to consider these bills. pp. H9126-49
12. REPORT. Rep. Evins, Tenn., inserted a summary of the major projects and accomplishments achieved during his tenure of office. pp. H9117-21

The bill's passage, it seems, is assured. By rejecting the conference report now before us, however, we can temporarily send the bill back to conference for revisions that could clear away some of the most startling abuses of the taxpayers' money. The conferees, for example, could restore the House amendment passed July 31 to limit to \$20,000 the maximum subsidy payments granted to individual farmers or individual farm operations.

Initially developed in the depression years to help small farmers wrest a living from the soil, the farm subsidy program now lavishes money on giant farm operations that are quite capable of surviving—indeed, of flourishing—without subsidies. Studies carried out over the past few years make this fact amply clear. One study, for example, showed that fully 20 percent of all farm subsidies go to the 2 percent of American farmers who gross more than \$100,000 annually. Another study—this one just as alarming—pointed out that 6,579 individual farm operations received payments averaging \$50,000 and totaling \$333 million during fiscal 1967 alone.

The Congress has a responsibility—a clear responsibility—to end this misuse of Government funds.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I urge the rejection of this conference report so that the extension bill can go back to conference for revision.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Missouri has injected into this discussion of the agriculture subsidy program the work of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] on the procurement of M-16 rifles, I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution in this area.

There can be no question but that without the fine investigative work of the gentleman from Illinois and the excellent reporting in the Chicago Daily News the unfortunate situation surrounding the procurement of M-16 rifles would not have come to light. Nor is it likely that the U.S. Government would have moved to correct what has to be described as a scandalously handled procurement. I commend the gentleman from Illinois for the contribution he has made, and for the energy, diligence, and dedication which has characterized his work in the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, am I correct that in the event the House votes disagreement with the conference report, the status of the bill is restored to the position it occupied before conference was asked?

The SPEAKER. The Senate amendment would then be before the House for further action.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, under that circumstance, a motion would then be immediately in order to send it to conference with or without instructions?

The SPEAKER. At that point, if it arrives, such a motion would be in order.

Mr. FINDLEY. And therefore disagreement with the pending motion to accept the conference report would not defeat the bill but rather place it in a position for the House to act?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to rule on that. The Chair has already answered two parliamentary inquiries for the gentleman. And the gentleman understands the situation.

The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 172, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

YEAS—189

Abbott	Everett	May
Abernethy	Evins, Tenn.	Mayne
Albert	Fascell	Meeds
Anderson,	Feighan	Miller, Ohio
Tenn.	Flood	Mills
Andrews, Ala.	Foley	Mink
Andrews,	Ford, Gerald R.	Mize
N. Dak.	Fountain	Montgomery
Annunzio	Fulton, Tenn.	Moorhead
Arendis	Fuqua	Morgan
Ayres	Galifianakis	Murphy, N.Y.
Barrett	Gardner	Myers
Battin	Gathings	Natcher
Belcher	Gettys	Nelson
Berry	Gonzalez	Nichols
Betts	Green, Pa.	Nix
Bevill	Griffin	O'Hara, Mich.
Bingham	Gross	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hagan	Olsen
Boggs	Hall	O'Neal, Ga.
Bow	Hamilton	O'Neill, Mass.
Brademas	Hammer-	Passman
Brasco	schmidt	Patman
Brinkley	Hardy	Patten
Brock	Harsha	Pepper
Brooks	Hathaway	Perkins
Brotzman	Hays	Pickle
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Poage
Burke, Mass.	Hull	Price, Tex.
Burleson	Hungate	Pryor
Burton, Calif.	Ichord	Purcell
Burton, Utah	Jarman	Quie
Bush	Johnson, Calif.	Quillen
Byrne, Pa.	Jonas	Randall
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Reifel
Cabell	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carter	Jones, N.C.	Rivers
Casey	Kastenmeier	Roberts
Clark	Kazen	Rogers, Colo.
Colmer	Kee	Ronan
Culver	Kelly	Rooney, N.Y.
Cunningham	Kleppe	Roush
Curtis	Kluczynski	Saylor
Davis, Wis.	Kornegay	Schadeberg
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Scherle
Dellenback	Kyl	Schwengel
Denney	Langen	Selden
Devine	Latta	Sikes
Dingell	Leggett	Skubitz
Dole	Lennon	Smith, Iowa
Dorn	Lloyd	Smith, Okla.
Dowdy	Lukens	Springer
Downing	McCulloch	Stanton
Duncan	McFall	Steed
Eckhardt	McMillan	Stephens
Edmondson	MacGregor	Stubblefield
Edwards, La.	Mahon	Stuckey
Eilberg	Mathias, Calif.	Sullivan
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Talcott

Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tuck
Udall

Vigorito
Waggoner
Watson
White
Whitener

Whitten
Winn
Wylie
Young
Zwach

NAYS—172

Adair	Gubser	Pucinski
Adams	Gude	Railsback
Addabbo	Haley	Rees
Ashbrook	Halpern	Reid, Ill.
Bates	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Bennett	Hanna	Reinecke
Boland	Harvey	Reuss
Bolton	Hechler, W. Va.	Rhodes, Pa.
Bray	Helstoski	Riegle
Brown, Mich.	Hicks	Robison
Broyhill, Va.	Hollifield	Rodino
Buchanan	Hoyton	Rogers, Fla.
Burke, Fla.	Howard	Rooney, Pa.
Button	Hunt	Rosenthal
Cahill	Hutchinson	Roth
Carey	Irwin	Roybal
Cederberg	Joelson	Rumsfeld
Celler	Johnson, Pa.	Ruppe
Chamberlain	Karsh	St Germain
Clausen	Keith	St. Onge
Don H.	King, N.Y.	Sandman
Clawson, Del	Kirwan	Satterfield
Cleveland	Kupferman	Schneebeli
Collier	Kyros	Scott
Collins	Lipscomb	Shipley
Conable	McCarthy	Slack
Conte	McClory	Smith, Calif.
Corbett	McCloskey	Smith, N.Y.
Corman	McDade	Stafford
Cramer	McEwen	Staggers
Daniels	Macdonald,	Steiger, Ariz.
Delaney	Mass.	Steiger, Wis.
Dent	Machen	Taft
Derwinski	Madden	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	Marsh	Tenzer
Donohue	Martin	Thompson, Ga.
Dulski	Mathias, Md.	Tieman
Dwyer	Meskill	Utt
Edwards, Ala.	Michel	Van Deerlin
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Vander Jagt
Erlenborn	Minshall	Vanik
Esch	Monagan	Waldie
Eshleman	Moore	Wampler
Fallon	Morris, N. Mex.	Watkins
Findley	Morse, Mass.	Whalen
Fino	Morton	Whalley
Frelinghuysen	Mosher	Widnall
Friedel	Moss	Wiggins
Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.	Williams, Pa.
Garmatz	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Bob
Glaimo	Ottinger	Wolff
Gibbons	Pelly	Wyatt
Gilbert	Philbin	Wyder
Goodling	Pike	Wyman
Gray	Pirnie	Yates
Green, Oreg.	Podell	Zablocki
Griffiths	Poff	Zion
Grover	Price, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—70

Anderson, Ill.	Ford,	Minish
Ashley	William D.	Nedzi
Ashmore	Fraser	Pettis
Aspinall	Gallagher	Pollock
Baking	Gurney	Rarick
Beil	Halleck	Resnick
Biester	Hansen, Idaho	Rostenkowski
Blackburn	Hansen, Wash.	Roudebush
Blanton	Harrison	Ryan
Bolling	Hawkins	Scheuer
Broomfield	Hébert	Schweiker
Brown, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Shriver
Brown, Ohio	Herlong	Sisk
Clancy	Hosmer	Snyder
Cohelan	Jacobs	Stratton
Conyers	Karsten	Thomson, Wis.
Cowger	King, Calif.	Tunney
Daddario	Laird	Ullman
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Walker
Dawson	Long, La.	Watts
Dickinson	Long, Md.	Willis
Dow	McClure	Wilson,
Farbstein	McDonald,	Charles H.
Fisher	Mich.	Wright
Flynt	Mailliard	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hebert for, with Mr. Minish against.

Mr. Blanton for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Farbstain against.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Nedzi against.
 Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Gallagher against.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
 Mr. Dow for, with Mr. Ryan against.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Scheuer against.
 Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Resnick against.
 Mr. Rostenkowski for, with William D. Ford against.
 Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Dawson against.
 Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
 Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.
 Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Jacobs against.
 Mr. Walker for, with Mr. Cowger against.
 Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Stratton against.
 Mr. Tunney for, with Charles H. Wilson against.
 Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Biester against.
 Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Broomfield against.
 Mr. Hansen of Idaho for, with Mr. Clancy against.
 Mr. McClure for, with Mr. Gurney against.
 Mr. Blackburn for, with Mr. Halleck against.
 Mr. Pollock for, with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts against.
 Mr. Shriver for, with Mr. Hosmer against.
 Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Mailliard against.
 Mr. Hansen of Idaho for, with Mr. Pettis against.
 Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Bell against.
 Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Karsten against.
 Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. King of California against.
 Mr. Snyder for, with Mr. Long of Maryland against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Harrison.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Schweiker.
 Mr. Fraser with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. NIX and Mr. EVINS of Tennessee changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POAGE, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 7735, DUTIABLE STATUS OF ALUMINUM HYDROXIDE AND OXIDE, CALCINED BAUXITE, AND BAUXITE ORE

Mr. BOGGS, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7735) relating to the dutiable status of aluminum hydroxide and oxide, calcined bauxite, and bauxite ore, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and ap-

points the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, BOGGS, KARSTEN, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and CURTIS.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 653, RATE OF DUTY ON CERTAIN NONMALLEABLE IRON CASTINGS

Mr. BOGGS, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 653) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain nonmalleable iron castings, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, BOGGS, KARSTEN, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and CURTIS.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3068, FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. POAGE, Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3068) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 19, 1968).

Mr. POAGE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. POAGE, Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of the conferees on the part of the House submit a conference report which was signed by only four of the managers on the part of the House. All of the conferees on the part of the Senate signed the report.

Those of us who signed this report feel that the report embodies those provisions which are most important to the future of the food stamp program.

Members will recall that the other body reported and passed in May 1968, a bill which would increase the appropriation authorization for fiscal year 1969 for the food stamp program by \$20 million. This increase raised the appropriation authorization from \$225 million to \$245 million for the fiscal year 1969.

There were no other amendments, changes, or extensions in the Senate measure.

On the 2d of July 1968, after 3 days of hearings before the House committee, a bill incorporating the same dollar amount increase was reported. In addition, the bill as reported to the House included amendments which were designed and intended to prevent the use of food stamps in furtherance of industrial disputes or their issuance to students in institutions of higher learning.

These amendments expressly provided that no person eligible to receive stamps prior to becoming a student or striker would be rendered ineligible solely because of the change of this single condition. Further, it was felt that funding should be utilized only for the welfare of persons genuinely in need through no fault of their own or through circumstances over which they had no control.

There was considerable debate of this measure on the floor of this House on the 29th and 30th days of July last. Upon passage on the 30th, the bill had been amended to provide for funding amounts of "such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972." A reporting provision which would require the Secretary of Agriculture by January 20 of each year to set forth in a report to the Congress the operations under the act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year was added. The so-called striker and student amendment was retained as reported. The effect of the House bill was to extend appropriation authorization for an additional 3 years, a 4-year period in all, and to remove the ceiling from the money to be spent on this program.

It will be recalled that the Secretary in his original communique to the Committee on Agriculture had asked only for the \$20 million increase granted by H.R. 18249. In his appearance before the committee on June 12, 1968, the Secretary requested unlimited funding authority.

Considerable testimony was given about the scope and extent to which this program should be carried: That is, its philosophy, the number of persons to be covered, the best agency to determine eligibility, and so forth. There are on this floor almost as many versions of answers to those questions as there are Members.

The conference committee first met with quite a disparity of opinion as to a solution. The Senate was not amenable to the retention of the striker and student prohibition. There was a difference of 3 years in the appropriation authority of the two bills. There was a vast difference in the funds which the respective Houses sought to authorize, the House had no limit and the Senate increased the existing authority by only \$20 million.

The ultimate outcome, the report signed by four of the managers on the part of the House, deleted the amendment which would have made strikers and students ineligible. It was felt by many of the conferees that the present language of the act limiting participation to those households whose income is a substantial limiting factor in attainment of an adequate diet should remain unchanged. In any event there has been no record vote on such a question in this

House, and we felt that bringing this report back without the amendment would permit the House to work its will and pass on the question in a motion to recommit with instructions to replace the prohibition.

As to the amount of funds which would be authorized under the conference measure, it should be noted that the \$90 million we propose to increase appropriations during fiscal 1969 is 40 percent more than the existing authority. This would authorize a program of \$315 million magnitude during fiscal 1969 as compared with \$185 million in 1968, an increase in 1969 of \$130 million, more than 70 percent, over the previous year. Despite the ambitious plans of some for this program, it is suggested that such a rate of growth is all that can reasonably be made effective in a single year with any degree of efficiency and economy of operation.

The conference committee agreed that consolidation of this expansion and the possible continued growth, mindful of the future state of the Nation's economy and the need to cut spending wherever possible, dictated no more than a \$25 million increase in the succeeding fiscal year of 1970. A proportional amount to continue the program to the end of calendar year 1970 was also provided.

Through this compromise the increased appropriation authority was extended 2½ years until December 31, 1970.

Thus under the conference report it remains a voluntary program, which means that local and State governments will determine where the program will operate and the conditions for eligibility. State and local governments will continue to pay about two-thirds of the administrative costs of operation, with the Federal Government paying the other third. Federal contributions for administration cover part of the cost of certifying nonwelfare families and individuals.

Since 1965, when 1,940 areas were participating in the commodity distribution program, the food stamp program has increased from 110 areas to 1,180 currently—September. Over half of these areas were formerly in the commodity distribution program, and today, the number of commodity distribution areas has dropped to 1,444.

The current estimates of the department are that to continue a program of existing magnitude will cost \$245 million in 1969. To add those areas designated but not authorized, a total of 141 areas with 216 thousand participants, will cost an additional \$15 million. Together with a \$5 million reserve for expansion in the new areas, the Department estimated minimum costs for 1969 are now \$265 million. Modification of the program to increase participation in existing areas could conceivably cost another \$60 million. This would be a total of \$325 million. The conference substitute of \$315 million would be well within the optimistic range of this projection.

The conference substitute would also retain the reporting provision inserted by the House. With the reports to be made on past operations and projected needs, it is felt by a majority of your conferees that adequate provision would

exist for revision of appropriation authority or eligibility conditions. I therefore submit the report and urge adoption of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this report goes a long, long way in the direction which those who have been most interested in the food stamp program would like to go.

I would point out that this report extends the program into fields where many Members have felt that it should not go. However, we were faced with a practical situation of whether or not bringing in a report, which in effect would give any opportunity whatsoever to this House to make any decision on these difficult points.

Mr. Speaker, the four members who signed the report felt that it was of prime importance to give this House an opportunity to make a clear-cut decision as to what it wanted to do to this food stamp program. It is for that reason that we have reported the bill with the deletions or amendments to which a great many Members took exception.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the strong argument that can be made in favor of these amendments but recognizing the vital importance of this program and the vital importance of the entire food and agricultural program of America, it is my purpose as one of those who signed this report to vote for the report that I signed and brought back to the House.

I want it clearly understood right now that I am supporting the whole ball of wax, and I hope the House will adopt this program because I believe that it is a reasonable program which will give the needed impetus to the food stamp program and at the same time give us a reasonable degree of local control over the participation therein.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I shall make a motion to recommit this conference report with instructions. The Members are all familiar with the issues, I believe, so I shall be very brief.

You may recall that when this measure was before us in the House bill I offered an amendment which was adopted on a teller vote, and stayed in the bill as we passed it, to prohibit distribution of food stamps to strikers and college students.

Primarily, I am interested in the use of this device to subsidize strikes. To me this is not an antilabor position at all. The strike may be entirely justified, but all unions, I believe, have funds they have accumulated designed to take care of their members who are in need when they are on strike.

The overall amount of money limit in the program, as it has been in the past, and as it will be in the future, is restricted, so if we use food stamps to allow strikers who may with good cause be trying to get their hourly wages raised from \$3.75 to \$4 per hour, we may be taking literally the food out of the mouths

of people who are really in need, abandoned mothers and children, people with big families, people who are unemployable, who are trying to get along on \$3 or \$4 a day, and not \$3 or \$4 an hour.

I do not believe the American taxpayers should be expected to devote their money to this sort of a device. That is the issue. It is clear and simple.

Mr. Speaker, I will at this time make a little legislative history. You have probably been made aware of the fact that through a communication received this morning there is some question about the words "labor disputes" in the bill, or in the bill as we passed it, as including lockouts. That was not my intention. I so declare now. And if this motion passes and the bill returns to conference, I will attempt to persuade—and I believe I will have no difficulty—the other conferees to make this matter clear in their report.

This prohibition is intended purely for voluntary strikes and walkouts, not lockouts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that at the appropriate time when I do offer my motion, that it be favorably acted upon.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN. Would the gentleman agree that in his opinion it was not the intent of Congress to make this an aid to education program, as it seemingly has been used for?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I certainly would. I supported almost all the aid to education program but I do not consider the food stamp program to be in that category. I understand that in the gentleman's district in Nebraska there is one school where as many as one-third of the students are receiving food stamps. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in the conference committee, and I was a conferee, I supported two of the changes that were agreed to in conference between the House version and the Senate version of the bill. That was the 1½-year extension as opposed to a 3-year extension, and the amount of money we agreed on to appropriate for this program for that time.

But I did not sign the conference report because of the removal of what is being referred to as the Teague amendment which excludes food stamps use for strikers and college students.

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 Congress changed the status of the food stamp program from a pilot project authorized by the executive branch to a full-scale national program authorized by law. Even a cursory review of the debate on the bill at that time reveals that Congress intended the program to aid the involuntarily poor, not those who voluntarily, for one reason or another have tem-

porarily reduced their short-run earning power to increase it over the long run. Congress did not intend to provide program benefits for students and strikers.

Time and again during consideration of this legislation then, it was pointed out that the program was intended to help the needy—the unemployed, the unemployable, families on welfare, mothers with dependent children, the aged, the blind and disabled—in short, those people who through no fault or choice of their own are involuntarily the victims of incomes inadequate to provide them with the quality, quantity and kind of food necessary to assure a proper diet.

Apparently, this was not spelled out clearly enough in the law itself in 1964, but the House recently took an important step toward rectifying this situation by approving on July 30 of this year, the provision prohibiting the use of food stamps either to aid education or to support labor disputes. Now, however, the House must again reaffirm this principle in order to achieve its incorporation into the law.

Congress, in 1964, attempted to avoid, insofar as possible, drafting legislation with any built-in potential for Federal heavyhandedness or redtape to cause unnecessary problems at the State and local levels. The States were left with the primary responsibilities for determining eligibility of participants in the food stamp program. Congress set up basic guidelines for the program and established the legislative intent, but a basic element of that intent has been somehow overlooked in the administration of the law.

The 1964 Food Stamp Act, Public Law 88-525, specified in its title that a principal purpose was "to provide for improved levels of nutrition among low-income households." The President, in his message on poverty of March 16, 1964, urged enactment of the food stamp program "to protect those who are especially vulnerable to the ravages of poverty."

Representative HAROLD COOLEY, the gentleman from North Carolina, was then chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and stated during House debate on the bill:

This program is a program for poor people, for hungry people . . . and . . . it will go to people of modest incomes who cannot provide their families with the necessary food. Take a mother who is receiving aid for dependent children. She could take part of that money and go in and buy bonus food stamps.

In the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry expressed concern over the definition of "eligible households" and asked for the Agriculture Department's suggestions as to how the program might be restricted more clearly to low-income groups. The thrust of the debate in both bodies was that the program should be directed toward the involuntarily poor and needy.

At this time when we are faced with a critical budgetary situation, and must make every dollar stretch as far as it can possibly go, there is an even more imperative necessity to clarify congressional intent as to who has the greatest need for assistance through the mechanism of the food stamp program. Who should have

priority when Federal funds are limited?

Students and those involved in labor disputes have far more alternatives for financial assistance than do mothers with dependent children, families on welfare, the unemployable, and other involuntarily poor and needy people. Strikers have access to special funds provided by their unions, and ordinarily, they have a salable skill and assurance of work in the future. Students have a multiplicity of sources of financial assistance—loans, fellowships, scholarships, GI programs, work-study programs, and many others. Every food stamp dollar provided to strikers and students means there is one less for someone more genuinely in need. It has been said that this amendment is a "cruel" one. Well, is it not cruel to reduce the help which can be offered to the aged, the blind, the disabled, widowed mothers with large families?

This is the tragic study of so many of our welfare programs. We change criteria and qualifications, or let down restrictions, and the result is always that the pie has to be cut into smaller pieces—available funds get spread thinner so that the truly needy are squeezed even further, and are denied adequate assistance for basic needs. What has been barely adequate becomes less than adequate. Congress never intended food stamps to be used by the voluntarily poor, but only by those who are needy through circumstances, not choice.

Some of my colleagues will say that the amount of Federal funds expended on strikers is so insignificant that the abuse does not merit restriction by law. Why, they say, should we write in a new provision because of \$115,751 in Federal food stamp money given to strikers during 1 month in Detroit; because of \$102,542 spent in two Ohio cities in 1 month; because of \$85,428 in Montana during one strike? And here I am talking just about the amount of Federal tax money spent to supplement the strike fund allotments—and this does not include administrative costs of additional offices and personnel required to handle a temporary flood of food stamp requests or the amount contributed by the stamp recipients.

Let us speculate for a moment on the total costs of this one program abuse. Estimate that the Federal Government spent \$100,000 on strikers in each of the 41 States participating in the program in fiscal 1968—41 as of May 1968—and this is not an unreasonable estimate in light of Detroit's experience in 1 month—an average of \$100,000 per State quickly mounts up to \$4.1 million taken away from the poor. This is one-fifth the increase the Secretary of Agriculture originally asked the Agriculture Committee to authorize for fiscal 1969, saying he could meet the needs of those counties waiting to participate with this amount.

I do not consider this \$4.1 million a month insignificant, and on a yearly basis it could amount to much more.

Again, the irony in this situation becomes even more apparent when you stop to consider the double blow this is giving the hard-core disadvantaged. Not only are they being deprived of this amount, initially, but they are also vic-

timized by the inflation such subsidies aid and abet.

Food stamps are not a tax-financed college student or strike fund supplement. They should not be used to aid special interest groups at the expense of the poverty stricken.

I urge my colleagues to stand firm, and require that this amendment be retained.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I like the way the gentlewoman from Washington has described her position on this question. I rise in support of the remarks that she has just made.

I also rise in support of the motion to recommit which will be offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Committee and the House voted to restrict the abusive use of food stamps by strikers and college students, because they felt that this amendment was vital to the most effective use of the program.

I quote from the Agriculture Committee report on H.R. 18249:

In view of the original intent and purpose of the food stamp program, the acute need to stretch the funds of government to reach as many of the needy as possible and the adequacy of other resources, public and private, to help students and participants in industrial disagreements, the committee voted to prohibit the use of stamps either to aid education or to support industrial disputes, and that's actually what it amounts to.

I feel strongly that these reasons are becoming even more true as the weeks go by. We are facing a crisis of confidence—our constituents wonder if we are really trying to help the poor—they wonder if Federal programs are answering the needs for which they were set up—they wonder what is being done about our financial crisis and when they will see some signs of fiscal responsibility coming from Washington.

I believe this amendment, in its own small way, responds to each of these worries and that is why I will vote to recommit the bill to conference.

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that when the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] offers his motion to recommit with instructions, that it is defeated. And I hope that the conference report as reported by the conferees will be adopted by the House.

I do not know how many of you folks have ever been in a town in which there has been a prolonged strike. I can tell you that the people who really suffer during a strike are not the men who are themselves out on strike, but the families—the wives and children of the strikers. All of us know that every one of the striking men that go out on strike

whether they voted for the strike or whether they did not—and I do not think any strike vote in any union was ever unanimous—want to invoke hardships upon their wives and children at home.

By voting to adopt the Teague motion to recommit you are actually saying that because a father is out on strike and he does not have enough liquid assets to buy the simple necessities for his family, you are going to penalize the children and their mothers of the men who are on strike. That is what the Teague motion does. I do not care how you try to color it, that is its effect.

The Teague recommittal motion also says that we are not going to give anything to students.

Is it not rather ludicrous that the House of Representatives and the Congress which has been so generous in other matters and in passing legislation to provide our children with more and more education, should then turn around and say, "If you do not have enough money to get food, we will not enable you to use this system".

If we really want to bring up children who can perform well in school, we have to have children who are well fed. One of the principle purposes of this food stamp program—and it has worked wherever it has gone into effect—is to see that children and families who get the benefits of this program have a balanced diet.

It is said everything is available for the college students. Congress has been so liberal in the GI bill just referred to that we do not even give children today, who have been out defending our country, as much money to go to school as we gave to children at the end of World War II.

I sincerely hope the deserving students and people who are out on strike, and their families, are going to be able to get food in this country which has been blessed with such an abundance of natural resources.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill has not yet been characterized accurately. I say this without any reference to its distinguished sponsor, a gentleman I have had the honor to serve with and whom I respect. I am talking about the character of the bill itself. I think it is not an antilabor bill but an antistudent bill as well. I think it is a bill that seeks to bring pressure on those involved in strikes to go back because their children are hungry, and contradicts all this Congress efforts to encourage higher education.

I think this violates the tradition in the United States that the Government does not make strikes and it does not break strikes.

I have not heard anyone stand up and describe the tax benefits available to corporations. They can deduct depreciation costs and income losses whether directly or indirectly the result as a result of labor disputes. We give the benefits of deductions under the Internal Revenue law to

corporations, regardless of how they are involved in strikes or work stoppages.

If we want to be fair about this matter we should treat both parties of the union we should not permit the corpora-labor dispute fairly. If we adopt the motions to be awarded contracts by Government, to allow them to deduct depreciation for equipment, or allow them to deduct for strike or other losses. It would be far better to leave this matter alone and follow the usual practice of keeping the Government out of the collective bargaining process.

We have a wonderful collective bargaining system that we boast about, and we say it is a free collective bargaining system. If it is to be a free collective bargaining system, we have to assume that sometimes there will be strikes, and strikes may be justified or they may not be, just as the activity of a corporation in refusing to sign a contract may be justified or it may not be.

Do we intend to come in now and say if there is a laborer who decides to vote for a strike under the collective bargaining system, and he goes out on strike, then regardless of how much the family may suffer, we will not permit them to have food stamps?

And what about the worker who votes against the strike?

Mr. Speaker, a very distinguished Senator in the conference, a senior Republican Senator in the other body, said he felt this amendment was vicious, and he quoted the situation that arose in his own State, where members of his State belonging to an industrywide union voted to go back to work, and members of the union in other States voted to stay out. He said under this amendment his union people desiring to go back would not be permitted to have food stamps.

Second, he pointed out that we have done many things in the Congress to encourage people to go to college. We have passed the Higher Education Act, and the student loan programs, and other legislations which the gentlewoman from Washington referred to. This bill is an attack on every student in any institution of higher learning. Any student in college or in the university will not be eligible for food stamps unless he received stamps prior to going to school, under the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE]. Yet, if the same student quits school life, leaves college, and takes his family out on the beach and does nothing—does not do one single useful thing to help himself or to improve society—he is entitled to food stamps.

What irony. What nonsense.

Furthermore, we have had this program under State administration. The States decide who should be given food stamps and who should not. They administer the program on the basis of need.

Some of those in this body who object to guidelines ought to realize this motion would establish a new dictatorial Federal guideline. Under this motion no State may give food stamps to strikers or students, unless they are already receiving them, however much their need might

be, and whatever the State might desire to do.

There are many political leaders in our country in both parties who feel the Federal Government has intervened too much in State-administered programs and brought too much control to Washington, yet this is exactly what the Teague amendment would do—federalize eligibility for food stamps.

I believe we would be wise to totally reject this amendment. It is a terrible intervention in the free collective bargaining process. It aims not at strikes but at innocent families, and especially children. It is a slur on every student and family who attends an institution of higher learning. It is a depreciation of the efforts of those who are trying to improve themselves and to make a better life for themselves and their families and to serve society better.

Also, I believe we ought to be aware that there may be some returning veterans for whom, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, the GI bill may not be sufficient.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it would not be the intention of the sponsor, but it might be the effect of the amendment, to deny food stamps to a returning Vietnam veteran who has a family he is unable to support under the existing GI bill provisions.

When it comes right down to it, what is the thrust of this amendment? It is merely to express a generalized hostility toward students and workers. There are not very many people in either category who receive benefits from this program, because there are strike funds or other employment for workers and because most students have other means of support.

It would be tragic, I believe, to accept this amendment. It is an emotional attempt to capitalize on bad feeling which exists because of militant student activity at some universities, and it gives the impression that somehow all strikers are acting against the public interest.

I hope we have a greater belief in the free enterprise system and free collective bargaining than that, and a greater belief in the benefits of higher education than that.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, when we first brought the first food stamp plan before the House I understood it to be on the theory that there were certain people who had some money to buy groceries but they did not have enough to provide an adequate diet and this food stamp program was brought up for the purpose of supplementing their diet and giving them proper nutrition.

Just like every other program that we bring out, everybody tries to get aboard. We started out in 1965 with \$75 million; in 1966, \$100 million; in 1967, \$200 mil-

lion; in 1968, \$200 million, and in 1969 there is \$225 million. That is the amount of the authorization for this year. This bill ups that to \$315 million for this year, \$340 million for 1970, and \$170 million for the first 6 months of 1971.

So we can see that regardless of how modestly a program starts out it just gradually mushrooms. That is the reason why we had to cut \$6 billion and to pass a tax bill in order to keep the dollar somewhere near solvent in the international monetary system.

My colleagues over here have possibly made a good case for a poor striker's children who ought to be fed, but keep in mind that it is not a question of whether you are going to take away the money from the striker's children. The question is are you going to take the money away from somebody who does not even have an opportunity to go on strike and give it to that person. If we just had enough money to go around so that we could take care of everybody in this country who needed anything and we used this as a Federal aid to education program, which this present bill would do, and if we wanted to use the food stamp plan as a strikebreaking plan, that would be one thing. My colleague over here says when the Government would not give these children food stamps, they were entering into the strike. The mere fact that you do not go in there and support a family of strikers so that they can strike longer, then that means that the Federal Government, by omission, is entering into a strike. This is what they say. It appears to me it is just the very opposite of that. If you go in and use tax money to support families so that they do not need to work, then you are supporting a strike and are using the taxpayers' money for that purpose. Worse than that, you are not just using the taxpayers' money but you are using the money appropriated for the purpose of taking care of poor people. You are using the poor people's money to support the strike. Now, maybe if we had plenty of money and could take care of everyone, I do not know that I would object to this, but I do object to taking the poor people's money, the money of people who have no other source of income, and using that to support a strike when the striker does have another source of income.

On the question of Federal aid to education, here is a Vietnam war veteran who comes back. The GI bill of rights does not give him enough funds to go to school. Let us not give charity to this Vietnam war veteran. If we are not giving him enough money to get an education, let us raise the GI bill of rights so that they can get sufficient money for their education. Because he was a veteran does that not mean we have to give him charitable money and make him a charity patient because the Federal Government will not give him enough money.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. I join the gentleman in his desire to raise the benefits under the GI bill. It is a splendid suggestion.

But in the meantime, do you mean that we should deny food stamp aid to these veterans even though their children may be hungry?

Mr. BELCHER. I am saying that if a Vietnam war veteran needs help to go to school, let us not make him a charity patient to do that. Let us not give him charity. Let us raise the GI bill of rights high enough so that he can go to school with those funds. Let us not use the food stamp plan for Federal aid to education or as a strikebreaking device, because sooner or later the backers of the food stamp plan are going to load this thing down to the extent where you just will not have anything. The taxpayers some day are going to rebel against paying taxes. I get letters—and I know that the gentleman from Washington does too—which say, "I object to having my tax money taken for the purpose of supporting people that will not work when they get a job." You get letters like that and so do I. This is just absolutely the most glaring example of taking the money of the taxpayers and using it for people who are going out on strike that I know of.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELCHER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman, I know, has supported Public Law 480, which has as its purpose to provide food aid for hundreds of thousands of needy and sometimes starving people in India and other places in the world. I am glad that I have supported that bill, and I assume that the gentleman is glad that he supported it, also. But I suggest to the gentleman that perhaps both of us should stop supporting Public Law 480 if there is not enough money to take care of the people in this country who are starving and who are suffering from malnutrition before we assist the Indians in Bihār. Before we worry about the Indians in Bihār, maybe we ought to worry about some of the people in the United States.

Mr. BELCHER. That is a very fine emotional statement, except for the fact that it does not hold water.

We have passed Public Law 480 to increase the sale of our surplus and to get rid of our surplus commodities of the American farmer. And, the reason that we are sending those products overseas is because if we kept them in the United States, if we kept them in this country, it would break the farm price program. That was a real promotional proposition and not a question of making it a charitable program. It seems that every program of this type which we have undertaken sooner or later gets into a charitable program just like Public Law 480 and just like this is going to be if we keep right on loading all things onto it.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if it is true that we passed Public Law 480 solely for the benefit of the farmers and not to be charitable and generous and humane to the other peoples of the world, then we should not pose as being generous and humane with respect to this program when we passed it.

Mr. BELCHER. I might say that I have always been in favor of this proposition for humane activities. I think we are all for Public Law 480 so long as it is limited to that purpose.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I did not intend to cast any aspersion upon the gentleman and if he takes exception to any inference on my part that he is generous or humane, I apologize.

Mr. BELCHER. I am not so inhumane that I am going to take food out of the mouths of poor children in order to stop a strike and you would not either, and if the gentleman would just stop and think, he would see the light.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman objected very strongly to the addition of the \$30 million for the first year of this program, which in my opinion is a minimum amount in order to provide for a reasonable implementation of the program. Now the gentleman says we do not have enough money to carry out the full intent of the program and he is the one that led the attack in cutting it down.

Mr. BELCHER. I imagine that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] voted for this tax hike and also voted for the \$6 billion cut and all of the other programs that include the poverty program and everything else while he is going to cut \$6 billion out of your party's budget but yet we will raise the amount carried in this bill by the sum of \$115 million. In other words, when you put an additional \$115 million into this bill you are going to take \$115 million off of that \$6 billion cut for which the gentleman voted.

Mr. FOLEY. I voted for the increase in the tax rate and also voted for cutting spending. I am going to stand by that vote. But I do not go along with the idea that all of these programs should be cut equally. I am willing to take cuts and have taken cuts on various kinds of public works projects which are located in my congressional district, and I had just as soon see a Federal office building cut out if it means a more adequate diet for poor people and the innocent children. However, I do not feel that we should start cutting the expenses of the Federal Government by denying children an adequate diet. If we are not a rich enough nation to take care of that problem, then we are not exercising the best judgment in the expenditure of our wealth.

Mr. BELCHER. I do not say take the food stamps away from the poor people in order to give them to strikers, either. That is where the gentleman and I differ. It is not a question of how much money we are going to spend but to whom we are going to give the money. I did not expect the gentleman to use more than half of my time when I took the well of the House.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington.

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. I think we ought to get the discussion back on the real point which we were trying to make before the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] got us off the track.

There is no one on this committee who has any intention of denying one needy child. We are trying to make the point that this program belongs to people who are truly needy and are unable to help themselves. There is not enough now to go around, according to the arguments from that side of the aisle and the arguments which were made before our committee. If the programs which are now in existence in the Government are not adequate to provide adequate diets for strikers, for college students, and returning GI's, then let us not rob this food stamp program but strengthen the existing programs for students, GI's, and so forth, in order to take care of them. That is the matter under disagreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say I am happy or delighted over the conference report on the food stamp bill because it certainly would not be true. We won a terrific victory here in the House in July on this issue, after 130 Members of this House had joined in the introduction of an open-ended authorization bill—a record number of cosponsors of any bill in the House, I believe. Although we won the fight on the floor and overturned the committee, the committee has had the last word, by abandoning the basic principle of the House position in conference.

The dollar amount authorized by this conference bill for the present fiscal year—\$315,000,000—is not so bad. It is \$90,000,000 more than the present ceiling of \$225,000,000, and \$70,000,000 more than the Senate had passed or the House Agriculture Committee had approved. It should be almost adequate to meet the needs for this year. The Secretary had testified he would need \$100,000,000 over the present ceiling in order to include all of the areas which have asked for the program. But most of them will now be able to come into the program this year, if the full funds are now appropriated, as I hope they will be.

LITTLE OR NO EXPANSION NEXT YEAR

But what about next year? The \$340,000,000 contained in this bill for next year would permit virtually no further expansion. All we are doing about the 1970 fiscal year and the remainder of the 1970 calendar year is making sure that the program can at least continue at the rate for this year until December 31, 1970, even if the Agriculture Committee takes no action. That is something. It is better than the present law in that respect, and better than the committee bill, which continued the program only to next July. But this bill is not what the House asked for and agreed to.

I am not going to try to send this bill back to conference, because I do not believe any practical purpose could be served by doing that. Some of the conferees, I am sure, would just as soon let the program die anyway.

But many of the Members, Mr. Speaker, will be unhappy next year, when areas in their districts want to come into the food stamp program, to find that under this legislation, sufficient funds cannot be appropriated to include them. This program has been expanding at a rapid pace in recent years for one reason only: The States and counties want it, in preference to the much-more-expensive direct commodity distribution system. It costs Uncle Sam far more to give away surplus commodities in a particular county than to administer a food stamp in that same area. Yet the one is infinitely a better program than the other. The difference is, that the food stamp program requires appropriated funds and the direct distribution program does not—the surplus commodity distribution is handled through the section 32 open faucet, no limit, farm subsidy program.

Next year, we will have a choice in attempting to expand this food stamp program further. We can go back to the Agriculture Committee again and beg and plead, and be brushed aside as we always have been, and then beat them on the floor, as we have always done, and then see the victory watered down in conference, as has always happened, or we can decide on some other parliamentary means to pass a good food stamp bill. I hope the 129 Members who joined me this year in introducing the bill we passed here in July over the committee's objections will join me next year in a more satisfactory approach to our legislative dilemma on this bill.

THE CRUEL AMENDMENT

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge—with all the persuasiveness I can muster—that the expected recommit motion to tack on the so-called striker-college student amendment be roundly defeated. It is sponsored by enemies, not friends, of the food stamp program. It was originally adopted in committee by the votes of Members who then voted against the bill even as so amended.

It is a cruel amendment—intended to punish the children of anyone caught in a labor dispute—even if the labor dispute is found by the courts to have been the result of illegal actions by the employer. In those instances, the workers get back pay for the period they are out of work. But you cannot feed children retroactively. As for the students—usually they are married veterans, living on the Cold War GI bill allotments, or graduate students skimping to get along on very little money. Do not punish them for wanting to learn.

If there are abuses in this respect—and all we have in the record are the cases of a few students at Kearney College in Nebraska, several athletes with cars, who allegedly drove down to the food stamp office in a Thunderbird or Lincoln Continental to get the stamps—it is now within the power of the local welfare authorities to weed out and

prosecute anyone obtaining the stamps under false claims of being poor.

I can see many instances where medical students, or students with large families, might qualify for this program. How can anyone vote to deny an adequate diet to any American who is too poor to buy a decent diet, merely because he is going to college or graduate school?

We do not deny food stamps to the children of convicted felons, to the children of family deserters, to the children of institutionalized dope addicts, to the children of immoral mothers, to the children of any other category of low-income Americans. Then why punish children whose fathers are sacrificing in order to go to college to make a better life eventually for themselves and their children—and eventually pay a whole lot more taxes—by acquiring an education? And why punish children whose parents are caught in a major labor-management battle where the individual worker has one voice among thousands, or hundreds of thousands, in deciding whether a union shall strike? Surely this cannot be a serious proposal intended to improve the food stamp idea of assuring adequate diets for low-income families.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues today to adopt the conference report on the food stamp program. I can vouch for the effectiveness of this program in providing food assistance to our low-income families. Five counties in my State are participating—one of them—Silver Bow County—has been in the program since it began as a pilot operation in the spring of 1961.

During the last fiscal year, low-income families in these counties benefited from almost \$1 million in additional food purchasing power. You can imagine what this has meant in human terms to the families with children, to the elderly—almost \$1 million worth of food buying power that they would not have had in the absence of this program.

And it is a self-help program—not a handout. The people in these Montana counties paid more than \$1.4 million to purchase coupons before they received that \$1 million in bonus coupons. This means that these people had to want as well as need more food. They had to budget the purchase requirement from their limited resources. More and better food was important to them—good nutrition was important to them. It is not always easy for these families to budget that money month in and month out in the face of competing needs for that dollar but the food stamp program is a tremendous help to our low-income families.

In addition to more and better food on the table, that extra \$1 million did a lot for the small-town grocer and the food stores in the communities in these counties. That is a lot of extra business for many of the stores in my State.

Two counties in my State that had asked to come into the program, and had been told they could have, had to be deferred for some months now for lack of adequate Federal funding. One of these is in my district. Five other counties have requested the program—two in my district.

This conference report should go far toward assuring State and local leaders that we are very serious about this program and that it will be available to them.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the work of the conference committee and urge support of the compromise food stamp bill reported by the committee.

Last year, we amended the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to permit appropriation of \$225 million for the 1969 fiscal year. That amount is not sufficient to permit the Department of Agriculture to meet the demand for this highly beneficial and worthwhile program which has gained such tremendous popular support. So, again this year, we are considering food stamp legislation to permit the appropriation of additional funds.

Food stamp legislation passed by the House would have provided the Congress with unlimited appropriation authorization through fiscal year 1972. This, I feel, would be the preferred course of action, since it would permit the Congress to appropriate funds each year in the light of developing situations.

The Senate version provided an appropriation of not over \$245 million for the 1969 fiscal year. The compromise bill—providing appropriation authorization of \$315 million for fiscal year 1969; \$340 million for fiscal year 1970; and \$140 million for the first half of fiscal year 1971—is reasonable. I urge its support.

We are well into the 1969 fiscal year with the Department of Agriculture still unsure of its funding situation with regard to the food stamp program. Delay in approving the food stamp bill can only hurt this most valuable program. I therefore, strongly support and urge the acceptance of the compromise bill now before us.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of the amendment to the Food Stamp Act of 1964 which has been proposed by House-Senate conferees. I am in favor of its provisions.

It has been said—or at least implied—that by making workers on strike eligible for the food stamp program on the same basis as all other low-income families, the Federal Government is in effect intervening on behalf of the strikers. The level of food benefits received represents such a small proportion of a family's total expenses—particularly a family that has been accustomed to a high weekly wage—that it is doubtful that the availability of food stamps has any impact on the decision to continue or suspend a strike. What the food stamps do is to help assure these families diets on which they can maintain their health and vitality during a temporary absence of or decline in the family income.

It has also been that there has been abuse of the food stamp program among participating students. This may be true in some isolated instances. However, it must be remembered that the students of today are the backbone of our leadership tomorrow and among our total enrollment in the colleges and universities today are many who are struggling to

obtain the knowledge and know-how which will be necessary if they are to fulfill their role as our future leaders. Surely it is important that they receive the same consideration given other low-income people.

I commend the conferees for their fairness and the judgment they have displayed in the consideration of this amendment as it pertains to these segments of our population. Again, I urge passage of this bill as it now stands.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the food stamp program has proven during the last 4 years to be an ingenious method for multiplying the effective purchasing power of people who are unable to obtain the food they require through normal marketing channels. Since its inception in 1964, the food stamp program has helped over 4 million needy people. The program began operating in 22 States. Today, 44 States and the District of Columbia are participating. The food stamp program operates now in almost 900 counties throughout the country.

With the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 this Nation made a commitment to obliterate poverty in America. But the war on poverty can be no single-headed effort. The effort to break the cycle of deprivation and want cuts across every area of governmental responsibility and becomes the responsibility of every citizen.

One of the greatest needs we have found among the poor of this country is for an adequate diet. Poor people are identified by a mark of unsatisfied hunger. How can we expect a child to benefit from a Headstart program when his stomach is empty? How can a man learn a new trade through an MDTA program when he is physically and mentally wracked by his own hunger and that of his family? The obvious answer is that the success of the war on poverty depends to a great extent on the adequacy of the diets of those we expect to actively participate.

This conference report on the extension of the food stamp program falls short of the ideal. I have proposed and introduced a bill which would extend the program for 4 years with no ceiling on authorized funds. This was the form of the bill that finally passed the House. I still feel that we cannot adequately predict what the demands on the food stamp program will be next year and the year after. I remain convinced that sufficient congressional control can be maintained through the appropriation process, year by year, as we come to know the food needs of the poor. This report places a ceiling on food stamp program authorizations for fiscal year 1969 of \$315 million, for fiscal year 1970 of \$340 million, and for the first 6 months of fiscal year 1971 of \$170 million. If one child goes hungry because of an inadequate authorization, then we have failed. In all good conscience we cannot allow hunger and abundance to live side by side in America. We should not tolerate pockets of near starvation in our lands of plenty. We cannot shake the responsibility—moral and political—to provide a decent diet for those who are unable to provide

for themselves. We cannot sit by and watch the majority of American families sit down to meals of relative abundant proportions, while a minority eat twice a day, and then only many times beans, gravy, and rice.

It is obvious that this conference report represents the maximum amount we can expect this year. It remains my feeling that the no-ceiling authorization was more realistic and responsive to the clear needs of America.

Mr. Speaker, there will be a motion offered today to recommit this report with instructions to include a prohibition against participation in the program by workers on strike and students. I opposed this proposal when it was adopted in the House bill and I remain against it. This amendment has a flavor of a covert assault on the recognized right of men to join together to bargain with their employers. This Nation has long protected the concept of collective bargaining; the Congress has given unions legal status; we have always supported the worker's right to strike when necessary. It would be incongruous to say to striking union members: You workers cannot participate in the Federal food stamp program once you exercise your right to strike. The food stamp program should be based on need, pure and simple. If a worker's family is suffering from malnutrition because of a low salary, then the family should be entitled to participate in the program. If a poor student, working his way through college, has insufficient money to buy food, then he or she should be allowed to participate. Do we want to discourage collective bargaining or seeking a better education by this program? The answer should be obvious. One of the most admirable aspects of this program is that it has concentrated on helping to feed those who are hungry rather than trying to fill hungry stomachs with red-tape. This program should continue in this manner, free from all extraneous restrictions. We should reject any proposal which would deny the right to eat to those who exercise their right to strike.

Mr. Speaker, I foresee a great future for the food stamp program. I have seen its impact in Hudson and Union Counties in the 13th District of New Jersey. And I foresee a much greater impact in the future in lifting the tremendous and grinding burden, borne by those whose economic resources are severely limited, of providing themselves and their families with enough to eat. Our duty to ourselves and our fellow citizens is clear. As Adlai Stevenson said, A hungry man is not a free man. In this land of liberty we can never tolerate men deprived by hunger. Whatever the cost may be to provide an adequate and effective food stamp program, we Americans cannot afford to spend less. If we shirk our duty now, we court disaster for ourselves and our children.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit. The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Teague of California moves to recommit the conference report on S. 3068 to the Committee of Conference with instructions to the Managers on the part of the House to insist on the following provisions of the House amendment to such bill:

"Section 5(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is engaged in a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to the existence of a strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as a result of engaging in such strike, labor dispute, or voluntary work stoppage. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is a student attending an institution of higher learning shall be ineligible to participate in any food stamp program established pursuant to this Act: *Provided further*, That if any such person was eligible for and was receiving food stamp assistance pursuant to the provisions of this Act prior to being enrolled as a student at an institution of higher learning, such person shall not be ineligible for participation in the food stamp program solely as the result of being a student attending an institution of higher learning."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 187, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

YEAS—158

Abbott	Brotzman	Collins
Abernethy	Broyhill, N.C.	Colmer
Adair	Broyhill, Va.	Cramer
Andrews, Ala.	Buchanan	Davis, Wis.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burke, Fla.	Dellenback
Arends	Burleson	Denney
Ashbrook	Bush	Derwinski
Ayres	Byrnes, Wis.	Devine
Bates	Cabell	Dole
Belcher	Carter	Dorn
Berry	Cederberg	Dowdy
Betts	Chamberlain	Downing
Bow	Clausen	Duncan
Bray	Don H.	Edwards, Ala.
Brinkley	Clawson, Del.	Edwards, La.
Brock	Cleveland	Erlenborn
	Collier	Esch

Eshleman	McClory	Scherle
Findley	McCloskey	Schneebeli
Ford, Gerald R.	McMillan	Schwengel
Fountain	MacGregor	Scott
Fuqua	Mahon	Selden
Galifianakis	Marsh	Sikes
Gardner	Martin	Skubitz
Gettys	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, Calif.
Goodling	May	Smith, N.Y.
Griffin	Mayne	Smith, Okla.
Gross	Meskill	Springer
Gubser	Michel	Stelger, Ariz.
Hagan	Miller, Ohio	Steiger, Wis.
Haley	Mize	Stephens
Hall	Montgomery	Stuckey
Hammer-	Myers	Taft
schmidt	Nelsen	Talcott
Hardy	Nichols	Taylor
Harsha	O'Neal, Ga.	Teague, Calif.
Henderson	Passman	Thompson, Ga.
Hunt	Patman	Tuck
Hutchinson	Pirnie	Utt
Jarman	Poff	Vander Jagt
Johnson, Pa.	Price, Tex.	Watkins
Jonas	Purcell	Watson
Jones, N.C.	Quie	Whalley
Keith	Quillen	Whitener
King, N.Y.	Railsback	Whitten
Kleppe	Reifel	Wiggins
Kornegay	Reinecke	Williams, Pa.
Kuykendall	Riegle	Wilson, Bob
Kyl	Roberts	Winn
Langen	Robison	Wyatt
Latta	Rogers, Fla.	Wylie
Lennon	Roth	Wyman
Lipscomb	Rumsfeld	Zion
Lloyd	Schadeberg	

NAYS—187

Adams	Gray	O'Neill, Mass.
Addabbo	Green, Oreg.	Ottenger
Albert	Green, Pa.	Patten
Anderson, Ill.	Griffiths	Pelly
Anderson, Tenn.	Grover	Pepper
Annunzio	Gude	Perkins
Barrett	Hamilton	Philbin
Bennett	Hanley	Pickle
Beverly	Hanna	Pike
Bingham	Harvey	Poage
Blatnik	Hathaway	Podell
Boland	Hechler, W. Va.	Price, Ill.
Bolton	Helstoski	Pryor
Brademas	Hicks	Pucinski
Brasco	Hollifield	Randall
Brooks	Horton	Rees
Brown, Mich.	Howard	Reid, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Hungate	Reuss
Burton, Calif.	Ichord	Rhodes, Pa.
Button	Irwin	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Joelson	Rogers, Colo.
Cahill	Johnson, Calif.	Ronan
Carey	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, N.Y.
Casey	Jones, Mo.	Rooney, Pa.
Celler	Karth	Rosenthal
Clark	Kastenmeier	Roush
Conable	Kazen	Roybal
Conte	Kee	Ruppe
Corbett	Kelly	St Germain
Culver	Kirwan	St. Onge
Cunningham	Kluczynski	Sandman
Daniels	Kupferman	Saylor
de la Garza	Kyros	Scheuer
Delaney	Long, Md.	Shipley
Dent	McCarthy	Slack
Diggs	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Dingell	McDewen	Stafford
Donohue	McFall	Staggers
Dulski	Macdonald,	Stanton
Dwyer	Mass.	Steed
Eckhardt	Machen	Stubblefield
Edmondson	Madden	Sullivan
Edwards, Calif.	Mathias, Md.	Tenzer
Eilberg	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Evans, Colo.	Meeds	Tiernen
Everett	Miller, Calif.	Udall
Fallon	Mills	Van Deerlin
Fascell	Mink	Vanik
Feighan	Monagan	Vigorito
Fino	Moorhead	Waldie
Flood	Morgan	Wampler
Foley	Morris, N. Mex.	Whalen
Fraser	Morse, Mass.	White
Frelinghuysen	Morton	Widnall
Friedel	Mosher	Wilson,
Fulton, Pa.	Moss	Charles H.
Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.	Wolff
Garmatz	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyder
Gathings	Natcher	Yates
Gialmo	Nix	Young
Gibbons	O'Hara, Ill.	Zablocki
Gilbert	O'Hara, Mich.	Zwack
Gonzalez	O'Konski	
	Olsen	

NOT VOTING—86

Ashley	Ford,	Minshall
Ashmore	William D.	Moore
Aspinall	Gallagher	Nedzi
Baring	Gurney	Pettis
Battin	Hallock	Pollock
Bell	Halpern	Rarick
Biester	Hansen, Idaho	Reid, Ill.
Blackburn	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Blanton	Harrison	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boggs	Hawkins	Rivers
Bolling	Hays	Rostenkowski
Broomfield	Hébert	Roudebush
Brown, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Ryan
Brown, Ohio	Herlong	Satterfield
Burton, Utah	Hosmer	Schweiker
Clancy	Hull	Shriver
Cohelan	Jacobs	Sisk
Conyers	Karsten	Snyder
Corman	King, Calif.	Stratton
Cowger	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Curtis	Landrum	Thomson, Wis.
Daddario	Leggett	Tunney
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Ullman
Dawson	Lukens	Waggonner
Dickinson	McClure	Walker
Dow	McCulloch	Watts
Evins, Tenn.	McDonald,	Willis
Farbstein	Mich.	Wright
Fisher	Mailiard	
Flynt	Minish	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Minish against.
Mr. Satterfield for, with Mr. Leggett against

Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Moore against.
Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Battin for, with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Hull against.
Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Stratton against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Cohelan with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Mailiard.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Ford, William D. with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hansen.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Daddario, with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Curtis.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Hallock.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Walker with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. King of California with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Wellman with Mr. Boggs.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Herlong.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 245, nays 98, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

YEAS—245

Adams	Gude	Pelly
Addabbo	Hamilton	Pepper
Albert	Hammer-	Perkins
Anderson, Ill.	schmidt	Phillbin
Anderson, Tenn.	Hanley	Pickle
Andrews, N. Dak.	Hanna	Pike
Annunzio	Hardy	Pirnie
Ayres	Harsha	Poage
Barrett	Harvey	Podell
Bates	Hathaway	Price, Ill.
Bevill	Hechler, W. Va.	Pryor
Bingham	Helstoski	Purcell
Blatnik	Hicks	Quie
Boggs	Holifield	Railsback
Boland	Horton	Randall
Bolton	Howard	Rees
Bow	Hungate	Reid, N.Y.
Brademas	Hunt	Reifel
Brasco	Ichord	Reuss
Brooks	Irwin	Rhodes, Pa.
Brotzman	Joelson	Riegle
Brown, Mich.	Johnson, Calif.	Robison
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Pa.	Rodino
Burton, Calif.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Button	Jones, Mo.	Ronan
Byrne, Pa.	Karh	Rooney, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kastenmeier	Rooney, Pa.
Cahill	Kazen	Rosenthal
Carey	Kee	Roush
Carter	Keith	Roybal
Casey	Kelly	Ruppe
Celler	Kirwan	Sandman
Clark	Kleppe	St Germain
Clausen, Don H.	Kluczynski	St. Onge
Cleveland	Kupferman	Saylor
Conable	Kuykendall	Schadewberg
Conte	Kyl	Scherle
Corbett	Kyros	Scheuer
Culver	Langen	Schwengel
Cunningham	Latta	Skubitz
Daniels	Long, Md.	Slack
de la Garza	McCarthy	Smith, Iowa
Delaney	McClory	Smith, N.Y.
Dent	McCloskey	Springer
Diggs	McCulloch	Stafford
Dingell	McDade	Staggers
Donohue	McEwen	Stanton
Dulski	McFall	Steed
Duncan	Macdonald, Mass.	Steiger, Wis.
Dwyer	MacGregor	Stephens
Eckhardt	Machen	Stubblefield
Edmondson	Madden	Stuckey
Edwards, Calif.	Mahon	Sullivan
Edwards, La.	Matsunaga	Talcott
Eilberg	May	Taylor
Esch	Mayne	Tenzer
Eshleman	Meeds	Thompson, Ga.
Evans, Colo.	Meskill	Thompson, N.J.
Everett	Miller, Calif.	Tiernan
Fallon	Mills	Udall
Fascell	Mink	Vander Jagt
Flood	Monagan	Vanik
Foley	Moorhead	Vigorito
Ford, Gerald R.	Morgan	Waggonner
Fraser	Morris, N. Mex.	Waldie
Frelinghuysen	Morse, Mass.	Wampler
Friedel	Morton	Watkins
Fulton, Pa.	Mosher	Whalen
Fulton, Tenn.	Moss	Whalley
Garmatz	Murphy, Ill.	White
Gathings	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitten
Gibbons	Natcher	Widnall
Gilbert	Nelsen	Williams, Pa.
Gonzalez	Nix	Wilson,
Gray	O'Hara, Ill.	Charles H.
Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Mich.	Wolf
Green, Pa.	O'Konski	Wyatt
Griffin	Olsen	Wyllie
Griffiths	O'Neill, Mass.	Wyman
Grover	Ottinger	Yates
Gubser	Passman	Young
	Patman	Zablocki
	Patten	Zwach

NAYS—98

Abbitt	Bennett	Broyhill, Va.
Abernethy	Berry	Buchanan
Adair	Betts	Burke, Fla.
Andrews, Ala.	Bray	Burleson
Arends	Brinkley	Burton, Utah
Ashbrook	Brock	Bush
Belcher	Broyhill, N.C.	Cabell

Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Cramer
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fountain
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gettys
Goodling
Gross

Hagan
Haley
Hall
Henderson
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McMillan
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mize
Montgomery
Myers
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Poff
Price, Tex.

Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Rumsfeld
Schneebeli
Scott
Selden
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Steiger, Ariz.
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Tuck
Utt
Watson
Whitener
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wydler
Zion

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Curtis.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Baring with Mr. King of California.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Karsten.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Resnick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOT VOTING—88

Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Battin
Bell
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bolling
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Clancy
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Cowger
Curtis
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Dickinson
Dow
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flynt

Ford,
William D.
Gallagher
Gialmo
Gurney
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrison
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Jacobs
Karsten
King, Calif.
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Lukens
McClure
McDonald,
Mich.
Mailliard
Mathias, Md.

Minish
Minshall
Moore
Nedzi
Pettis
Pollock
Pucinski
Rarick
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Ryan
Satterfield
Schweiker
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Snyder
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Walker
Watts
Willis
Wright

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Minish for, with Mr. Ashmore against.
Mr. William D. Ford for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Battin against.
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Pettis against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Walker with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Biester.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Dickinson.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 119, NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 119) to reserve certain public lands for a national wild and scenic rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 24, 1968.)

Mr. TAYLOR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hope I will not have to object, I take it that the gentleman will take a minute or two or three to explain what transpired in the conference.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman is correct. I will be glad to explain the basic changes.

Mr. GROSS. And yield perhaps for a question or two?

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued September 27, 1968
For actions of September 26, 1968
90th-2nd; No. 158

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....26	Highways.....22,41	Personnel.....32,40
Appropriations.....19	Honey.....35	Reclamation.....13,30
Congressional reform.20,29	Hunger.....6	Renegotiation.....8
Economic development....15	Imports.....35	Report.....27
Education.....17,28	Income tax.....38	Roads.....22,41
Electrification.....11,42	Inflation.....33	Rural life.....6
Expenditures.....34,41	Job Corps.....7	Scenic rivers.....2
Farm labor.....31,38	Land management.....9	School lunch.....39
Farm program.....21	Legislative program....25	Soil conservation.....14
Food stamps.....1,23	Meat imports.....3	Taxation.....14,38
Foreign aid.....5	Metric system.....10	Veterans.....37
Foreign relations.....24	Motion pictures.....5	Water conservation.....14
Grapes.....31	Natural resources.....11	Water pollution.....12
Guam.....15,43	Noxious plants.....16	Weather control.....4
Hearing examiners.....36	Organization.....18	Workweeks.....40

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on food stamp bill. Senate agreed to conference report on scenic rivers bill. House passed continuing appropriations resolution.

SENATE

- 1. FOOD STAMPS. Agreed to the conference report on S. 3068, which authorizes \$315 million for the food stamp program for the fiscal year 1969, \$340 million for 1970, and \$170 million for the first half of 1971. This bill will now sent to the President. p. S11516
- SCENIC RIVERS. Agreed to the conference report on S. 119, to reserve certain public lands for a national wild and scenic rivers system. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S11513-6

jurisdiction and located within the State in which the component lies that is classified as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The value of the exchanged lands shall be approximately equal, or shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or Secretary as the case may be.

Subsection (e) would authorize the transfer to the appropriate Secretary any federally owned property administered by another Federal agency which is within the park boundaries. Land acquired or transferred, under this subsection, to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture shall become national forest lands if it is within or adjacent to a national forest.

Subsection (f) authorizes the appropriate Secretary to accept donations of land and interests in lands, funds, and other property for use in connection with his administration of the system.

Subsection (g) provides that where land is acquired under the provisions of this Act, the owner of improved property may retain, as a condition to the acquisition, a right of use and occupancy for noncommercial, residential purposes for a term of not to exceed 25 years or in lieu thereof for a term ending at the death of the owner or his spouse, whichever is later. The right retained shall be subject to termination by the appropriate Secretary upon a determination that the property is being used in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Act. If the appropriate Secretary makes this determination, the retained right shall terminate by operation of law when the appropriate Secretary notifies the holder of the right of the determination and tenders him the fair market value of the right.

The term "improved property" as used in the previous section means a detached, noncommercial, residential dwelling, the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1967, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is located as is reasonably necessary for its enjoyment.

Section 7(a): This section specifically prohibits the issuance by the Federal Power Commission of a license to build any impoundment, water conduit, reservoir, powerhouse, transmission line, or other project works under the Federal Power Act, as amended, on or directly affecting any river designated under section 3 of the Act as part of the System. It also directs that other Federal agencies shall not assist by loan, grant, license, or otherwise in the construction of any water resources project which would have both a direct and adverse effect on the values of such designated river. The Secretary administering the designated river is responsible for determining whether such project would directly affect the designated river, in the case of an FPC license, and whether such project would have a direct and adverse effect on the river, in the case of projects constructed with the assistance of another Federal agency or under such agency's license or permit. The term "water resources project," as used in this section, should be broadly construed to include any project that impounds, diverts and returns, or otherwise utilizes water in the river for various purposes with Federal assistance or under a Federal license that could directly and adversely affect the river. Your conferees wanted to make it clear that these prohibitions do not apply to upstream or downstream projects which will not unreasonably diminish the values of the river in existence on enactment. In some cases, these developments could be permitted if the applicant for the license, etc., includes some safeguards or other features in the project to prevent such adverse effects.

This section also provides further protection by requiring any Federal agency that intends to seek an authorization or an appropriation to construct a water resources project which would, as determined by In-

terior or Agriculture, as appropriate, have an adverse effect on the river to advise the appropriate Secretary at least 60 days beforehand and reports to Congress that the project would conflict with the purposes of this Act and would affect the river and its values.

Section 7(b): This section imposes requirements and prohibitions similar to the ones referred to in section 7(a) to rivers in the study category for five years after enactment and for the additional study period of three years, in the case of rivers recommended by Interior or Agriculture, or for one additional year, in the case of a State-named river.

Section 7(c): This section requires all Federal agencies to notify the appropriate Department of any existing studies, proceedings, or other activities, including license applications, which affect or may have any potential effect on any of the study rivers. These agencies are also required to so inform the appropriate Department on a continuing basis before such actions are actually commenced or resumed by the agency. Upon receipt of such notice, the appropriate Secretary will be able to undertake whatever efforts are necessary to make the determinations required by sections 7(a) and 7(b).

Section 7(d): This section provides that the provisions of sections 7(a), (b), and (c) are not intended to apply to grants made under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

It should be emphasized that the objective of all of section 7 of this Act is to protect the rivers designated under the Act or the rivers under study under this Act. It is not, however, intended to prevent all development, particularly in the case of the study rivers. The section contemplates that the appropriate agencies will continue to study and to consider applications for upstream and downstream developments, but that such studies or consideration will be subject to review and comment by the appropriate Secretary pursuant to this section.

Section 8(a): This section withdraws from entry, sale, or other disposition under the public land laws of the United States all public lands within the boundaries of rivers designated or to be designated under section 3 of the Act.

Section 8(b): This section provides a similar withdrawal for study rivers under section 5(a) of the Act.

Section 9: This section would continue the applicability of the United States mining and mineral leasing laws within components of the System, except that, in the case of areas designated under section 3 of this Act and in areas to be designated in the future, mining activities and mineral leasing activities shall be subject to regulation by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as appropriate. The issuance of a patent or the perfection of any claim affecting lands within the system designated under this Act or to be designated in the future would confer or convey a right to the mineral deposit and so much of the surface and surface resources as are reasonably needed to carry out prospecting and mining operations and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary.

Minerals in Federal lands which constitute the bed or bank of a river included in the system as wild river areas under the bill or some time in the future and which are within $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile of the river are withdrawn from the operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws. A similar withdrawal also applies to areas subject to study under section 5 of the bill, but prospecting or leases, licenses, and permits under the mineral leasing laws on these areas are not forbidden. This section also requires that the regulations will include safeguards to prevent pollution of the river and unnecessary impairment of the scenery.

Section 10(a): This section directs that each component of the system be adminis-

tered to protect and enhance its values without limiting, to the extent possible, other uses that do not substantially interfere with the public use and enjoyment thereof. It provides considerable flexibility in the development and execution of management plans for each component.

Section 10(b): Where a portion of a river is included in the Wilderness System, the Act provides that the Wilderness Act provisions and those of this Act will apply. Where there is a conflict the more restrictive will apply. This is not to say, however, that ordinary rules of statutory construction do not apply. A specific provision set out in this Act such as the one dealing with minerals or hunting and fishing or the one establishing the wilderness area would always control actions over more general provisions in the other Act.

Section 10(c): This section defines the laws applicable to each component administered by Interior. If the component is added to the National Park System or the National Wildlife Refuge System, the laws applicable to the appropriate System would apply. The provisions of this Act would also apply. Again the ordinary rules of statutory construction must apply. Where there is a conflict between the two laws, the more specific will control. Clearly, it is not the intention of your conferees that the Secretary administer each area added to the National Park System as a national park with all its restrictions. In most cases, the rules and regulations applicable to national recreation areas will probably apply to these components. The section also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to utilize all authorities available to him for recreation and preservation purposes and for the conservation and management of the various resources of each component, including the quality of the waters thereof.

Section 10(d): This section authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize general authorities available to him relating to national forests in connection with his administration of any component of the System.

Section 10(e): This section provides for cooperative arrangement with the States and local governments in the administration of each component.

Section 11: This section directs Interior to encourage the States to include State and local wild, scenic, and recreational rivers in their outdoor recreation plans, and to furnish technical assistance and advice to the States and local governments, and private interests in establishing such areas. The Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare and Agriculture are also directed to provide such advice and assistance.

Section 12: Under this section, each Federal agency is required to review its administrative and management policies, its regulations, contracts, and plans affecting lands under its jurisdiction which are in a study river or border thereon to determine what measures should be taken during this study period to protect the river. Special emphasis is given to timber harvesting, road construction, and other activities, including those which might affect water quality. This provision would not abrogate existing rights, etc., without the consent of the owner thereof. Each agency head is directed to cooperate with Interior and the State water pollution control agencies to eliminate or prevent pollution.

Section 13: This section does not change or modify any jurisdiction or responsibility the States have with respect to fish or wildlife. It does not take away or grant the States any more authority than they now have. This section also directs that hunting and fishing shall be permitted on lands and waters of each component of the System under applicable State and Federal laws and regulations except, in the case of hunting, where the component is part of a national park or monument. The appropriate Secretary may prohibit, limit or control hunting for rea-

sons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment.

State and Federal jurisdiction over waters of any component is to be determined by established principles of law. Enactment will not affect or impair valid or existing water rights and any taking thereof would entitle the owner to just compensation.

Enactment of the bill would reserve to the United States sufficient unappropriated water flowing through Federal lands involved to accomplish the purpose of the legislation. Specifically, only that amount of water will be reserved which is reasonably necessary for the preservation and protection of those features for which a particular river is designated in accordance with the bill. It follows that all unappropriated and unreserved waters would be available for appropriation and use under State law for future development of the area.

The Secretaries are authorized to grant easements and rights-of-way in connection with an area of the System in accordance with the laws applicable to the National Park System, in connection with Interior areas, and the National Forest System, in connection with Agriculture areas, subject to such conditions as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act.

Section 14: Section 14 deals with the effect of the claim and allowance of an income tax deduction for conservation easements donated for purposes of the Act. If such a donation is made and the deduction is claimed and allowed it will constitute an agreement that, upon breach of the terms of the conservation easement, the servient estate may be acquired at fair market value as of the time of the donation minus the value of the easement claimed and allowed as a deduction.

Section 15: This section defines the terms used in the Act.

Section 16: This section authorizes an appropriation of \$17 million for land acquisition.

REGULATION OF MAILING OF MASTER KEYS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14935) to amend title 39, United States Code, to regulate the mailing of master keys for motor vehicle ignition switches, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of September 24, 1968, pp. H9028-H9029, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill as passed by the Senate provided new legal restrictions on the mailing of certain master keys to automobiles, and had two further provisions which were not in the bill as it passed the House. One clarified the authority of postal inspectors to make arrests, and the other related to the fixing of wages for blue-collar Federal employees.

The conference report is substantially as the bill passed the Senate, with cer-

tain technical changes agreed upon by the conference committee members.

I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3068) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3068) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the phrase 'not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'not in excess of \$315,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of \$340,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; not in excess of \$170,000,000 for the six months ending December 31, 1970'; (B) by changing the word 'year' at the end of such first sentence to 'period'; and (C) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: 'On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year'."

And the House agree to the same.

W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
B. EVERETT JORDAN,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. CALEB BOGGS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as originally passed by the Senate, this bill would have increased the 1969 food stamp program authorization by \$20 million to \$245 million.

The House amendment would have removed the limit on this authorization and extended it to the 3 additional fiscal years ending in 1970, 1971, and 1972. The House amendment would also have required the Secretary to make progress reports by January 20 each year, and would have made strikers and students in institutions of higher learning ineligible to begin receiving stamps.

The conference substitute increases the authorization for fiscal 1969 to \$315 million, and provides an authorization of \$340 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and an authorization of \$170 million for the 6 months ending December 31, 1970. It also adds the reporting requirement that was contained in the House amendment. It does not include the provisions of the House amendment with respect to students and strikers.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT: WELL DESERVED PRAISE

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject "The Bureau of Land Management: Well Deserved Praise," prepared by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], who is unable to be present today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT: WELL DESERVED PRAISE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this past summer found interior Alaska swept by a series of catastrophic forest fires which originated in lightning storms.

It is customary, unfortunately, for those who are unfamiliar with our great State to think of it as a land of glaciers and snow—but it is not. Summer temperatures at Fairbank reach 90° and the rainfall and humidity in that period is low. Vegetation blooms and the land is green.

There is always the risk of forest fire because so much of interior Alaska's beauty is so poorly serviced by usable roads. Our lakes abound in fish and our forests are alive with wildlife. There is beauty everywhere but there is also the threat of fire. Those beautiful thunder-head clouds that form such a fine setting for this scenery also contain the seeds of destruction.

Since January 1, 723,000 acres, mainly in interior Alaska, have been consumed in 450 forest fires. This is an area larger than the State of Rhode Island. The area burned is about 2% of Alaska's 375 million acres. These are fires of tragic proportions, damaging for years to come a great and valuable resource.

Most of Alaska is still federal domain and the Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management has the responsibility for conservation operation over much of it. I would like, on behalf of Alaska's people, to call public attention to the excellent job the Bureau of Land Management is doing to carry out its obligations for the protection and management of the public domain in Alaska. These are lands which belong to all Americans. Their protection and management is a gigantic and difficult task. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record



Public Law 90-552
90th Congress, S. 3068
October 8, 1968

An Act

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended.

82 STAT. 958

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended (A) by deleting from the first sentence the phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not in excess of \$315,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of \$340,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; not in excess of \$170,000,000 for the six months ending December 31, 1970"; (B) by changing the word "year" at the end of such first sentence to "period"; and (C) by adding at the end of the subsection the following sentence: "On or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth operations under this Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year."

Food Stamp
Act of 1964,
amendment.
78 Stat. 709;
81 Stat. 228.
7 USC 2025.

Report to
Congress.

Approved October 8, 1968.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 1619 accompanying H. R. 18249 (Comm. on Agriculture) and No. 1908 (Comm. of Conference).

SENATE REPORT No. 1130 (Comm. on Agriculture & Forestry).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

May 17: Considered and passed Senate.

May 21: Reconsidered, amended, and passed Senate.

July 29, 30: Considered and passed House, amended, in lieu of 18249.

Sept. 25: House agreed to conference report.

Sept. 26: Senate agreed to conference report.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

1952

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
1952

1952

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
1952

